

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XXII.

BALTIMORE, JANUARY, 1907.

No. 1.

ADDISON'S *DISCOURSE ON ANCIENT AND MODERN LEARNING*.

In the admirable bibliography in the Wendell Greenough edition of Addison's *Essays* (Athenaeum Press Series, Ginn, 1905), *A Discourse on Ancient and Modern Learning* is placed among the "Doubtful Works"; but the internal evidence seems to me to show unmistakably that the *Discourse* is by Addison. In addition to a general similarity of style, there are a number of passages tallying closely in form and thought with parts of the essays on Milton and on the Pleasures of the Imagination. Hurd (Addison's Works, Bohn Ed. v, 214) "guesses" that it was "drawn up by him (Addison) in his younger days, and that it was not retouched or at least finished by him. The reason might be that he had afterwards worked up the principal observations of this piece into his critical papers on Milton." The *Dictionary of National Biography* says merely that the *Discourse* "is regarded by Hurd as genuine." A. S. Cook (Addison's *Criticisms on Paradise Lost*, Ginn, 1892) notes that the second and third of the selections from *Spectator* 273, quoted below, had been anticipated in the *Discourse*, "if, as Hurd supposes, this paper was written in his younger days." As a matter of fact, *Spectator* 273 draws largely upon the *Discourse*, one passage being transferred almost *en bloc*, and others being condensed and polished. Moreover, the germ of Addison's theory of the secondary pleasures of the imagination is to be found in the *Discourse*.¹

¹ Addison early developed a disposition to speculate on the pleasures of the imagination. Compare the following from the *Essay on the Georgics*, written when Addison was twenty-one: "Virgil . . . loves to suggest a truth indirectly, and without giving us a full and open view of it, to let us see just so much as will naturally lead the imagination into all the parts that lie concealed. This is wonderfully diverting to the understanding, thus to receive a precept that enters as it were through a by-way, and to apprehend an idea that draws a whole train after it. For here the mind, which is always delighted with its own discoveries, only takes the hint from the poet, and seems to work out the rest by the strength of its own faculties."

It is clear that the *Discourse* was a juvenile performance, which the author had no idea of publishing, and upon which he felt that he could draw at will. It did not appear until 1739, twenty years after the author's death. I append the most significant parallels:

Discourse.

"But as for the characters of such as lived in his (Virgil's) own time, I have not so much to say of him as of Homer. He is indeed very barren in this part of his poem, and has but little varied the manners of the principal persons in it. His Aeneas is a compound of valor and piety; Achates calls himself his friend, but takes no occasion of showing himself so; Mnesteus, Sergestus, Gyas, and Cloanthus, are all of them men of the same stamp and character."

Fortemque Gyan, fortemque Cloanthum."

Discourse.

"He (Milton) has obliged all mankind, and related the whole species to the two chief actors in his poem. Nay, what is infinitely more considerable, we behold in him not only our ancestors but our representatives. We are really engaged in their adventures, and have a personal interest in their good or ill success."

Discourse.

"And here the first and most general advantage the ancients had over us, was that they knew all the se-

Spectator 273.

"Virgil falls infinitely short of Homer in the characters of his poem, both as to their variety and novelty. Aeneas is indeed a perfect character; but as for Achates, though he is styled the hero's friend, he does nothing in the whole poem which may deserve that title. Gyas, Mnesteus, Sergestus, and Cloanthus, are all men of the same stamp and character. Fortemque Gyan, fortemque Cloanthum."

—Virg.

Spectator 273.

"The whole species of mankind was in two persons at the time to which the subject of his poem was confined. . . . Milton's poem is admirable in this respect, since it is impossible for any of its readers . . . not to be related to the persons who are the principal actors in this poem. But what is still infinitely more to its advantage, the principal actors in this poem are not only our progenitors but our representatives."

Spectator 273.

"There is another circumstance in the principal actors of the Iliad and Aeneid which gives a pecu-

Discourse.

cret history of a composure ; what was the occasion of such a discourse or poem, whom such a sentence aimed at, what person lay disguised in such a character : for by this means they could see their author in a variety of lights, and receive several different entertainments from the same passage. We, on the contrary, can only please ourselves with the wit or good sense of a writer, as it stands stripped of all those accidental circumstances that at first helped to set it off. We have him but in a single view, and only discover such essential standing beauties as no time or years can possibly deface."

Discourse.

"Nothing can be more delightful than to see two characters facing each other all along, and running parallel through the whole piece ; to compare feature with feature, to find out the nice resemblances in every touch, and to see where the copy fails, and where it comes up to the original. The reader cannot but be pleased to have an acquaintance thus rising by degrees in his imagination, for whilst the mind is busy in applying every particular, and adjusting the several parts of the description, it is not a little delighted with its discov-

Spectator 273.

liar beauty to those two poems, and was therefore contrived with very great judgment—I mean the authors having chosen for their heroes persons who were so nearly related to the people for whom they wrote. Achilles was a Greek, and Aeneas the remote founder of Rome. By this means their countrymen (whom they principally proposed to themselves for their readers) were particularly attentive to all the parts of their story, and sympathized with their heroes in all their adventures. A Roman could not but rejoice in the escapes, successes and victories of Aeneas, and be grieved at any defeats, misfortunes or disappointments that befell him ; or a Greek must have the same regard for Achilles. And it is plain that each of those poems have (*sic*) lost this great advantage, among those readers to whom their heroes are as strangers or indifferent persons."

Spectator 416.

"In all these instances, this secondary pleasure of the imagination proceeds from that action of the mind, which compares the ideas arising from the original objects, with the ideas we receive from the statue, picture, description or sound that represents them. It is impossible for us to give the necessary reason, why this operation of the mind is attended with so much pleasure, as I have before observed on the same occasion ; but we find a great variety of entertainments derived from this single principle, for it is this that not only gives us

Discourse.

eries, and feels something like the satisfaction of an author from his own composure. . . . When Phidias had carved out his Jupiter, and the spectator stood astonished at so awful and majestic a figure, he surprised them still more by telling them it was a copy ; and to make his words true, showed them the original, in that magnificent description of Jupiter, towards the latter end of the first Iliad. The comparing both together probably discovered secret graces in each of them, and gave new beauty to their performances."

Harvard University.

Spectator 416.

a relish of statuary, painting and description, but makes us delight in all the actions and arts of mimicry."

E. K. BROADUS.

ALL OF THE FIVE FICTITIOUS ITALIAN EDITIONS OF WRITINGS OF MACHIAVELLI AND THREE OF THOSE OF PIETRO ARETINO PRINTED BY JOHN WOLFE OF LONDON (1584-1588).

A. MACHIAVELLI.

1. *I Discorsi di Nicolo Machiavelli, sopra la Prima Deca di Tito Livio. Con due Tauole, etc. Nouellamente emmendati, & con somma cura ristampati.* | Device of a flourishing palm tree with toads and serpents about the root, and in its branches the words : *Il vostro malignare non gioua nulla* | In Palermo | Appresso gli heredi d'Antoniello degli Antonielli a xxviii di Genaio, 1584. Preface by the printer to the reader with promise to publish more of Machiavelli same date and place. Carte xvi + 200. 8°.

2. *Il Principe di Nicolo Machiavelli, Al Magnifico Lorenzo etc. Con alcune altre operette, i titoli delle quali trouerai nella seguente facciata.* | Device of the palm tree, etc., as in No. 1. In Palermo | Appresso gli heredi d'Antoniello degli Antonielli | a xxviii di Genaio, 1584. | Always in the same volume with the preceding but with

separate numbering of leaves and sheets. No Preface to the Reader. Carte 0 + 80. 8°.

3. *Libro dell'Arte della Guerra di Nicolo Machia- uelli Cittadino, et Secretario Fiorentino. Nouamente corretti (!), & con somma diligenza ristampati (!). Device of the palm tree as in Nos. 1 and 2. In Palermo appres so Antonello degli Antonelli. No year. On the cancel title page, which in most editions takes the place of the original one, the wording of the title is changed, and device, place and publisher are omitted and replaced by MDLXXXVII. No Preface to the Reader. Carte i + 151 and an extra size Plate for Figura vii. 8°.*

4. *Historie di Nicolo Macchia- uelli, Cittadino, et Secretario Fiorentino, Al Santissimo, etc. Nuouamente ammendate, & con somma diligenza ristampate, con licenza de superiori | Giolito's device | In Piacenza appresso | gli heredi di Gabriel Giolito | de Ferrari. 1587. Preface to the Reader with a reference to Antoniello's promise dated Piacenza, June 2, 1587. Pp. xii + 568. 12°.*

5. *Lasino | doro di Nicolo | Macchiauelli, | con tutte laltre | sue operette. La contenenza delle quali ha- | uera i nella seguente facciata. Lower part of Giglio's device | In Roma MDLXXXVIII. Preface to the Reader with a reference to Antoniello's promise dated Roma, May 20, 1588. 8°.*

B. PIETRO ARETINO.

1. A general title for the entire volume is lacking.

1. *La Prima Parte de Ragiona- | menti di M. Pietro Aretino, co- | gnominato il flagello de | prencipi, il veritiero, el diui | no, diuisa in tre Giornate, la | contenenza de le quali si | porra ne la facciata | seguente. Veritas odium parit. MDLXXXIII. Considerable space below. Preface by Barbargria to Reader dated Bengodi, October 21, 1584.*

La Seconda Parte de Ragiona | menti, etc., as above, Doppo le quali habbiamo aggiunto il Piaceuol | Ragionamento del Zoppino, composto | da questo medesimo autore per | suo piacere. Veritas, etc. No year. Close Bengodi. Commento | di Ser Agresto | da Ficaruolo sopra | la Prima Ficata del Padre Siceo. Con la Diceria | de Nasi. No year. Preface to Reader by L'Herede di Barbargria

dated Bengodi January (!) 12, 1584. Pp. xii + 228, viii + 401, 0 + 142. 8°. The numbering of sheets is continuous throughout the volume.

2. *Quattro | Comedie del | Diuino Pietro | Aretino. | Cioè | Il Marescalco La Talanta. | La Cortegiana L'Hipocrito. Nouellamente ritornate, per mezzo della | stampa, a luce, a richiesta de conosci | tori del lor valore. Head of Pietro surrounded by D. Petrus. Aretinus. Flagellum. Principum. in shape of a coin. MDLXXXVIII. Preface with a reference to Barbargria's promise, but no place or date. Separate title pages with year for the last three comedies. Pp. xvi + 292. 8°.*

3. *La | Terza, et | Ultima Parte | de Ragiona- | menti | del Diuino Pietro | Aretino. | Ne la quale si contengono due ragionamenti | cio è de le Corti, e del Giuoco, cosa morale, e bella. Head, etc., as in No. 2. Veritas Odium parit. Appresso Gio. Andrea del Melagrano | 1589. Preface with a reference to the promise of Barbargria dated from Valcerca January 13, 1589. Special title page for second part: Il Ragionamento | del diuino | etc. nel quale si parla | del Gioeo con mora- | lita piaceuole. Head as in No. 2 and M.D.XLXXIX (!) instead of 1589. Carte iii + 203. 8°.*

The problem of the real home and origin of the five fictitious Italian editions of Machiavelli of the years 1584-88 was first raised by Bongi,¹ who, realizing that they could not possibly have been printed in Italy, acutely conjectured from the peculiar lustre of the vellum of the binding of some of them that they must have come from England. At his instigation Alfred W. Pollard of the British Museum gave the matter some attention, as a result of which the following entries were made in the Museum Catalogue. Under *Discorsi*, 'The initial letters show that this book was printed at London by John Wolfe. The device on the title page was subsequently used by Adam Islip.' Under *Prencipe*: 'Printed like the *Discorsi* with the same imprint at London by John Wolfe.' Under *Arte*: 'Probably printed secretly at London by John Wolfe.' Under *Historie* simply: 'Probably printed secretly in London.'

¹ See: *Archivio Storico Italiano*, ser. 5, vol. XIX, 1897, and my article in the November issue of *Mod. Lang. Notes*, vol. XXI, 1906.

Under *Asino*, the same entry. The three editions of Pietro Aretino have, as far as I am aware of it, apart from Bongi's conjecture that the second might have been printed in France or England, not only never been attributed to John Wolfe but not even been located in England. The Museum Catalogue makes no suggestion regarding the first and puts 'Venice?' after the second and 'Paris?' after the third, while Bertani,² the latest biographer of Pietro Aretino, adds Venezia to the firm appearing on the title page of the third.

My own interest in this question was not thoroughly aroused until last summer, when, during a visit to Richmond, Indiana, I happened to notice perchance in the choice private library of some friends of mine, that Figura VII of the *Arte* of 1587 must in all probability have been taken from Peter Whitehorne's English translation of Machiavelli's work, which was dedicated to Queen Elizabeth and in the years of 1560-88 passed through no less than three editions. This prospective confirmation of the English origin of one of the five books gave me the conviction that a special investigation of the whole matter might yield more definite results than as yet had been obtained, and, relinquishing for the present my intention of continuing my study of Machiavelli in Florence and Venice, I came to London, where even my most sanguine expectations have been surpassed. My Richmond observation proved correct, a minute comparison and measuring of the type and the initial letters of other books printed by John Wolfe made it appear even more probable that he had issued the *Arte* and the *Historie* than that he had published the *Discorsi* and the *Prencipe*, and the last lingering doubts, of which I could not rid myself because I had noticed a few of Wolfe's initial letters also with other London printers of the time, were suddenly dispelled by direct and irrefutable testimony.

Searching one day for information on the life and person of John Wolfe, in the unparalleled Reference Library of the Museum, I came across *Typographical Antiquities or an Historical Account of the Origin and Progress of Printing in Great*

Britain and Ireland: containing Memoirs of our Ancient Printers, and a Register of Books printed by them, from the year MCCCCLXXI to the year MDC. Begun by the late JOSEPH AMES, etc. Considerably augmented—by WILLIAM HERBERT, etc.—London, MDCLXXXV, etc., 3. vols. 4°. I eagerly turned to John Wolfe who occupies Vol. II, p. 1170-1189 and, after casting a glance on the few remarks about his person and noticing that he was surnamed Machivill, I began to peruse the titles of the books he had printed. Nothing under 1584, 1587 or 1588 that had any special bearing on the question in hand, but when I came to 1593 I felt a thrill of delight. *Philadelphus, or A Defence of Brutes, and the Brutans History. Written by R. H.* Device a flourishing palm tree, with serpents and toads about the root, having this motto: *Il vostro malignare non gioua nulla, etc., etc.* Imprinted by him, 1593, etc.³ The palm tree of the *Discorsi*, the *Prencipe*, the *Arte*, in a book duly accredited to John Wolfe six years before Adam Islip made the first use of it when it had become rather worn out! That settled John Wolfe's claim to the first three editions. But that was not all. At the end of the list of books the titles of which were given in full there followed the statement: 'He had also licenses for the following,' and twice more I had occasion to rejoice. Under 1587 it said, '*Historio (!) de (!) Nicolo Machiaueli Cittadino et Secretario Florentino (!)*' and 1588, '*L'asine (!) d'oro dy (!) Nicolo Macchauegli (!)*.' The fourth and fifth directly accredited to John Wolfe and not even printed secretly. The Machiavelli problem was solved. But something else a little farther on caught my attention, still in 1588: '*Dialogo di Pietro Aretino vel (!) quale si parla del graco (!) con moranta (!) Piaceuole,*' in which the title of the second part of our third work of Pietro Aretino may be recognized and immediately afterwards, '*Ragionamento nel quale M. Pietro Aretino figura quattro suoi amici che fanellano (!) delle corti del mondo, e di quella del cielo.*' This, to be sure, is not the title which our third work has now but that which the first part had in the old edition of Novara, 1538. John Wolfe, therefore, in this case evidently produced

² Carlo Bertani, *Pietro Aretino e le sue Opere secondo nuove indagini*. Sondrio, 1901, p. 363, note.

³ The device shows some wear, proving that it was not used here for the first time.

the books he was going to reprint, not his own copy. Under these circumstances it may seem doubtful whether the '*Lettere di Pietro Aretino*,' for which he likewise received a license, were ever actually printed by him or not. The Museum does not seem to possess a copy that could be ascribed to him.

Applying to the Superintendent of the Reading Room, I learned through his courtesy that there also existed a diplomatic reprint of the principal source of Ames and Herbert's work, which fortunately covered the same period, viz.: *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London; 1554-1640 A. D.*, etc. Edited by EDWARD ARBER, etc. *Privately Printed.* London 1875 ff. 5 vols. 4°, from the second volume of which I transcribe for fuller information the following items:

18 Septembris [i. e. 1587]

John wolf. Receaued of him for printinge an Italian booke intituled *Historie di NICOLO MACHIAUELLI* Cittadino et Secretario Fiorentino. Authourised vnder th[e] archbishop of CANTERBURIES hand vi^a.

The statement '*Con licenza de superiori*' on the title of our edition is therefore not a fake; the Primate of England who, at that time, together with the bishop of London, exercised the supreme supervision on new publications, having sanctioned it.

xvii^o die Septembris [1588]

John wolf. Allowed vnto him for his copie, to be printed in Italian | a booke intituled *L'asino D'oro. Dy (!)*. NICOLO MACCHIAUELLI | vppon Condicon that yt may be allowed hereafter [no sum stated] beinge nowe allowed vnder th[e] h[and]es of master HARTWELL and master warden coldock. |

The archbishop, therefore, was not specially consulted this time nor was he in case of the following works of Pietro Aretino.

xx^o die Septembris. [1588]

John wolfe | Item allowed vnto him for his copie vnder th[e] h[and]es aforesaid. *Quattro Comedie Del Deuino(!)* PIETRO ARETINO [no sum stated.]

This entry was overlooked by Ames and Herbert in the compilation of their work, and estab-

lishes John Wolfe's title to the second work of Pietro Aretino. Finally:

xiii^{io} octobris [1588]

John wolf. Allowed vnto him for his copie *Dialogo Di PIETRO ARETINO nel quale riparla del groco (!) con moralita Raaceuole (!)*. [no sum stated] vnder master HARTWELL hand and Th[e] wardens.

J. wolf. Allowed vnto him for his copie. *Ragionamento. nel quale. Messire PIETRO ARETINO figura Quattro suoi Amici che fanellano (!) delle Conti (!) Del mondo. e di quella Del cielo.* [no sum stated] vnder master HARTWELL and Th[e] wardens handes.

After this follows the license for *Lettere di PIETRO ARETINO* discussed above.

It remains for me to give some of the circumstantial evidence of type and initial letters, and, although the discovery of the device of the palm-tree on John Wolfe's *Philadelphus* of 1593 assures his title to the *Discorsi*, the *Prencipe* and the *Arte* of Machiavelli, they will not be excluded in the following.

1. *Discorsi* and *Prencipe*: The round characters of the Preface to the Reader as well as the italics of the body of the text and the two principal kinds of initial letters all recur, as must have been stated by Pollard to Bongi, *l. c.*, in the *Vita di Carlo Magno Imperadore* by Ubaldino, printed by Wolfe in 1581. Examples of one or both kinds of these initial letters, however, are also met with in books by several other printers, viz., in Giordano Bruno's *Explicatio Triginta Sigillorum* of 1583, probably done by Vautrollier; *An Answer to the Untruthes*, etc., printed by John Jackson for Thomas Cadman, 1589; Ubaldino: *A Discourse concerninge the Spanish Fleete*, etc.; imprinted by A. Hatfield, 1590; *The Florentine Historie*, printed by Thomas Creede for William Ponsonby, 1595, and *The Fountaine of Ancient Fiction* and *A Discourse Against Nicholas Machiavell*, etc., printed by Adam Islip, with whom we also found the palm tree, in 1599 and 1602.

2. *Arte*: The italics of the text are identical with those of the Prefaces to the Reader in the *Asino* and the *Quattro Comedie* of Pietro Aretino and other books printed by Wolfe. The little ornament over the Proemio is found in the *Pastor*

Fido by Guarini, printed by Wolfe in 1591. The peculiar frame of the initial letter—a wrap is suspended above the centre—of the Proemio recurs in Stow's *Survey of London*, printed by Wolfe in 1598, pp. 60, 102 and 161. The initial letters of the several books are duplicated in Ubaldino: *Le Vite delle Donne Illustri*, printed by Wolfe in 1591, viz., Books III, IV, V and VII, on pp. 70, 54, 5 and 7.⁴ Finally, and this is the most telling correspondence, the very peculiar ornamental strip of the close of the Proemio and Book I occurs once more in Stow's *Survey*, p. 450, top.

If the *Historie* were not given to John Wolf by the Registers, parallels of type could be adduced from the *Pastor Fido* and of initial letters from the *Vite delle Donne*. Thus everything tends to bear out the evidence of the palm tree and the Registers and to confirm John Wolfe's title to all the editions of Machiavelli.

As for Pietro Aretino's second work which is accredited by the Registers, I will only say that it is in type, number of lines on page, etc., exactly like the *Comedie* and the *Asino*, and shares one initial letter with the *Vite delle Donne*, another kind with the *Comedie* and *Asino*, and the device on the title page with the *Comedie*. It, therefore, cannot possibly have been printed in Venice.

3. The first volume of Aretino. Here John Wolfe's claim is based on correspondences of type, initial letters and other ornaments almost exclusively since there exist two more editions of the first and second parts of it with the same preface by the fictitious Barbagrighia and the same year and date. Very fortunately circumstantial evidence is abundant. For convenience sake I designate the Parts by Roman and the Giornate by Arabic figures. The italics are those of the *Arte* and the other books cited there, and the large initial letters those of the *Discorsi* and the *Prenceipe*, though, as was stated above, they were not

confined to John Wolfe. The frame of the initial letter with the suspended wrap I, 1 is that of the *Arte* and the *Survey*. The frames of two kinds of initial letters not found in any other of the eight works under consideration likewise recur in the *Survey*, viz.: that of the Preface of Barbagrighia on p. 450, and those of II, 1; III, Proemio and III, Lettera on pp. 58, 94 and 147. Thus all initial letters can be duplicated from other books printed by Wolfe. But still more satisfactory evidence is offered by the recurrence of the characteristic large square ornament which serves to fill the vacant space at the close of several divisions of Aretino's volume at the close of the text of the often quoted *Survey*. Circumstantial evidence of such completeness cannot fail to carry a good deal of weight with it. It will be further strengthened in the second part of this paper, which will deal with John Wolfe's personality, the reasons for his not putting his name on these editions and his merits for the promotion of the printing of Italian books in England.

A. GERBER.

Flensburg, Germany.

THE FRENCH NOVEL OF INTRIGUE FROM 1150 TO 1300. II.

One of the most interesting of romances, intrinsically and historically, is *Amadas et Idoine* (c. 1180).¹⁵ The author has not looked abroad for his heroine. Idoine is a daughter of Burgundy, positive, energetic, commonsense, and of a vigorous morality. Amadas, having overcome Idoine's indifference, is called away home. His sweetheart is married by her father to the Count of Nevers. In her extremity Idoine summons the dread spinster Clotho and her sisters. The three frighten the Count into the belief that his countess has an awful malady.¹⁶ The disappointed Amadas, meanwhile, has become raving mad, and

⁴ Again these two kinds of initial letters did not belong to John Wolfe exclusively, the frame of the first recurring in 'An Answer to the Untruthes,' printed, as stated above, by John Jackson for Thomas Cadman, in 1589. The second in *The Florentine Historie*, also cited above, printed by Thomas Creede for William Ponsonby, 1595. The little ornament above the Proemio is found in practically identical shape in Giordano Bruno's *Candelaio*, Parigi, M. D. LXXXII.

¹⁵ *Amadas et Idoine*. p. p. C. Hippeau, Paris, 1863. Cf. *An English Miscellany Presented to Dr. Furnivall*, Oxford, 1901. Gaston Paris, p. 386 ff.

¹⁶ Engingniés est, partant s'en tient, l. 2441. Cf. *Cligès*, l. 3329.

wanders *amont, aval, et hors et ens*, coming finally to Lucca. Idoine informs herself of his condition and his whereabouts, and asks her husband's leave to make a pilgrimage to Rome. The Count, who is a man of affairs, is perfectly willing. With her esquire Garinès, Idoine sets out for Rome and stops at Lucca. She brings Amadas to his senses, persuades him to be reasonable when he protests that he is unworthy of her, puts fine raiment upon him, and sees to everything like the capable woman she is. The poet reflects on the subject of women :

Signor, je l'i di, bien ai garant, 3570.
 Fols est, qui en nule se fie. 3608.
 Pour ce, si est de feme fine,
 Boine, loial, et enterine
 Une des mervelles du mont,
 Que mult tres peu de tex en sont.
 Une boine .c. homes vaut.
 De ces boines est Idoine une 3663.

So much accomplished, Idoine falls ill. About to die, so she thinks, she takes measures to keep Amadas alive. She confesses :

"Par mon grant peciet amai
 Ains de vous, s'en soies certains,
 Lonc tans .iii. miens cosins germaines." 17

Amadas promises that with this information he will not die, whereat Idoine contentedly appears to. She is entombed. A certain ring revives her.

Idoine throughout has been stern with Amadas :

Que nus n'i puisse vilounie 6753.
 Noter, ne mal, ne felounie.¹⁸

She and Amadas get home to Burgundy, where she tells the Count she has seen St. Peter at Rome—"bele persoune me sambla"—and St. Peter has advised a divorce. The Count is in love with another woman and matters are amicably arranged.¹⁹ Chrétien, although he must be allowed the palm of priority, has been distanced on his own ground. Fenice is too absorbed to show much imagination.²⁰ Idoine employs the Fates.

¹⁷ P. 175—the line numbering is confused.

¹⁸ Cf. *Cligès*, 5251 ; *Chatelain de Coucy*, 3621.

¹⁹ ll. 7367 ff. Cf. Gröber, *Grundriss*, II, 2, 532—"Die Lösung der Ehe ist ganz modern."

²⁰ Cf. *Lanson*, *op. cit.*, pp. 52-53.

The author of *Amadas et Idoine* has equally failed to face the situation, for one reason because his is a story of love that will not be thwarted, only incidentally a novel of intrigue. But Idoine's resort to magic and the complacency of the husband in the case class the story with *Cligès* and *Éracle*. Another point in common between the three is, that however frivolous the handling of the intrigue may be, we are sufficiently admonished that women in love must not be *parceniers*. Who could imagine Fenice and Athenais and Idoine unfaithful to Cligès, Paridès and Amadas? Chrétien and his school seem blind to the logic of their code which might lead anywhere—*feme est li oisiax seur la rainne*.²¹ It is strange how few stories of irresponsible intrigue are to be found in the Old French period ; *Joufrois* (c. 1250),²² so far as I know, stands alone²³—evidently the work of a man to whom women are fair and not fond enough.

Count Joufrois, of Poitiers, Don Juan of his region, hears of a beautiful lady kept by her husband under watch in an ancient tower, near a city. Joufrois comes to this city for the tourneys, and in the field before the tower displays great prowess. At night he keeps open hostel.

Mais vos pas ne me demandez 1179.
 Si la dame del chastel vit
 Lo bel hostel que li cuens fit ?
 Oïl certes, tot a devise.

After Joufrois is gone—ne set qu'il fait qui feme gaite²⁴—Lady Agnes of the Ancient Tower sends out a man to make inquiries. The man returns and the lady is pleased :

"Va," fait ele, "je le cuit bien ; 1398.
 Qu'einz en mun cuer sor tote rien
 Pansoie je par devinaile
 Que ce estoit li cuens sanz faile.
 Biaux est et larcs et vigoros, 1405.
 Aperz et sages et cortois ;
 Ce ai oï dire maintes fois."

The Count comes back in the guise of a hermit,

²¹ *Dolopathos*, 4259.

²² *Joufrois*. Herausgeg. v. Konrad Hofmann und Franz Muncker, Halle, 1880. Cf. Gröber, *Grundriss*, II, 1, 776.

²³ The Provençal *Flamenca* is similar. For a translation of the crucial dialogue, cf. Suchier-Birch-Hirschfeld, *Geschichte der Französischen Litteratur*. Leipzig u. Wien, 1900, p. 89.

²⁴ *Éracle*, 4601.

a gaberlunzie man.²⁵ He had reckoned upon the sure effect of his lance play and largess within eyeshot of the tower. The husband of the lady is won by the godly bearing of the hermit and is moved to treat his wife with less severity. "God pardon me," he says, "you may do as you please from this day forth." She doubts at first, but her lord is serious and she is shrewd. She answers :

"Mais tant ai a pris ceste estage 1824.
Que jamais non voil a nul jor
Ensir de ceste aute tor,
Car n'ai pas ceste seigle a pris."

The husband is insistent :

"Ainz voil, qu'alez demain el jor 1842.
Veoit l'ermite en sa maison
Que ja ne verrez si bien non."

The next morning, accordingly, the lady visits the hermitage (ll. 1853-2147). Afterwards, her husband asks if the hermit is not as represented. The lady answers yes :

Quant cil l'oi, molt en fu liez. 2163.
"Dame," fait il, "bien feriez
Si sovenz li aliez veoir ;
Que grant pro i poez avoir
De celui, qui toz nos chadele."
Et cele dit, si fera ele,
Puis que lui plaist, dorenavant.

Nothing is dodged in *Joufrois*, except the stricter ethics. The story is full of the "joy of life." Poitou, the country of Queen Eleanor, sent its contingents as well as Provence to the baths of Bourbonne where *celosos extremeños*, like Count Archambaut, took precautions in vain against wives like Flamenca.

We are assured that heaven and hell were very present to these people of the Middle Ages. Few of them seem to have realized those extremes in themselves. Hence perhaps their simplicities and their evasions in such serious matters as the personal relations of men and women. The *Châtelain de Coucy*²⁶ (c. 1300) is the only novel of the list in which there is any attempt at thoroughgoing analysis of the heart. The story by contrast seems modern.

Note the introduction of a man in love. The

²⁵ Cf. *Châtelain de Coucy*, ll. 6610-6650.

²⁶ *L'Histoire du Châtelain de Coucy et de la Dame de Fayel*. p. p. G. A. Crapelet, Paris, 1829.

Châtelain de Coucy is enamored of the Dame de Fayel. He is announced at the castle :

Dist la dame : "Il soit bien venus : 133.
Or en r'alés à lui lasus
Et si li faites compaignie,
Et tant que g'iere appareillie."
La dame s'est tost acesmée, 149.
Car belle dame est tost parée.²⁷

The lady appears. She remarks the châtelain's troubled look and suspects the cause.

Lors dist : "Sire, je say de fit 186.
C'aucune chose vous anoie :
Se mes sires fust cy, grant joie
Vous feist, s'en fusse plus aise.
S'or n'i est cy ne vous desplaise.
Il i sera une autre fois."

The châtelain speaks of his heart. The answer is :

"Bien savés mes corps est liés 218.
Du fort lien de mariage ;
J'ay mary preu, vaillant et sage
Que pour homme ne fausseroie."

They go to supper. The châtelain is abstracted. The lady :

"Mengiés, je vous empri, 245.
Et par la foy que devés mi,
Faites un poi plus li chiere.
Vous fustes au tournoy l'autrier."
Dist la dame, "j'oy conter." 252.
—Haa ! dame, vous volés parler
D'autre chose que je ne voel."

The lady begins to think of her suitor's attractions. She hears him talked of ; he is conspicuous at tourneys :

La dame souvent ooit 349.
Maint recort qu'al cuer li touchoit.
Mès encor n'estoit pas ferue
Du dart d'amours.

The châtelain makes a song to his lady. A minstrel sings it in her presence :

Et quant sot que cilz l'avoit fait 417.
Qui maint travail ot pour lui trait,
Amours le cuer li atendrie.

²⁷ Cf. *Le Livre du Chevalier de la Tour Landry. Pour l'enseignement de ses filles*. A. de Montaiglon, Paris, 1854, ch. xxxi. D'une dame qui mettoit le quart du jour à elle appareillier, or, in the Tudor English translation, "I wolde ye knew an ensample of the lady that wolde have alwey a quarter of a day to arraie her."

The lord of Fayel is hospitable, unsuspecting.
When the châtelain calls again, Fayel says :

“ Dame, prenés 455.
Le chastelain et si lavés,
Qui nous a fait très grant honnour
Que ci fist ore son retour.
Lors ont lavé et sont assis.
De maintes causes ont parlé,
D’armes, d’amours, de chiens, d’oisiaus.
La dame n’ert pas enplaidie, 470.
Ains fu d’une maniere coie.
Et non pourquant ses iex envoie
Simplement vers le chastelain,
Esgarder ne l’ose de plain.

Fayel must be away to a case in court (un plait).
He bids his wife entertain their guest. Hostess
and guest play at *tables* and at talk. Wanting to
know when he will see her again, the châtelain
says :

“ Dame, j’entens que vous serés 667.
A la feste où li grant plentés
Ert des dames de cest pays.”
—Par Dieu, sire, vous dites voir 673.
Ma dame de Coucy her soir
Me manda que je y alaisse,
Ne pour nul soing ne le laissasse.”

In the lady’s heart common sense and passion
have debated (ll. 777 ff.). But at this tourney
the châtelain is very conspicuous. The heralds
give him honor :

La dame de Fayel ooit 1365.
Les parolles dont joie avoit,
Car li chastelains empresent
Véoit, et dedens son cuer sent
Que plus ne se poet destourner
Que il ne li conviegne amer.
Après souper avint ensy 1481.
Qu’au boire sist par dalès ly.
Tant ont là ensamble parlé 1500.
Qu’environ eulz sont tout levé,
Et lors d’ileuques se leverent.

They appoint a day for further talk, a Tuesday
when Fayel will be abroad. The Tuesday comes,
and the châtelain presents himself. They canvass
the situation. Wariness must be theirs, they
think. The châtelain suggests that a trusty maid
might help them :

La dame respont : “ Une en say 2217.
En qui très bien me fieray.
Et sy croy qu’elle va pensant 2227.
Un petitet no convenant
Puis les joustes de l’autre fois.”

A plan is sketched—secret doors, etc. The lady
opens her mind to the trusty maid, her cousin
Isabel. Isabel advises :

“ Miex ameroie estre dampné 2357.
Que par moy fuissiés acusée.
Et non pourquant vous avés tort
Que avés fait de ce acort :
Car moult m’esmerveill par m’ame
De vous qui estes haute dame,
S’aves mari preu et vaillant
Et sus ce faites un amant.”

Lady Fayel defends her course, but says she will
try her man the first time he comes to the wicket
gate :

“ Adont le verrés-vous cesser 2406.
De ci venir d’ore en avant ;
Et s’il m’aime ne tant ne quant,
Ne laira, quoy qu’à lui aviengne
Que souventes fois n’i reviegne.”²⁸

Having found the door barred against him, the
châtelain goes home and to bed, sick of disap-
pointment. The lady is distressed at this upshot
of her pleasantry. Isabel conveys word that
nothing serious was meant. The châtelain writes
a letter the answer to which (ll. 3049 ff.) fixes
another day. This second time he is not long
kept waiting. At break of day Isabel warns.
The châtelain asks when he may hope to come
again :

A cel conseil fu appellée 3611.
La damoiselle, car senée
Estoit, et de bons avis plaine ;

²⁸ Cf. *Le Chastoiement des Dames*. Robert de Blois :
Sämmt. Werke. Herausgeg. v. Dr. Jacob Ulrich, Berlin,
1895. l. 750 :

S’il vous aime tant con il dist
Ne laira por nul escondit
Qu’il reviegne.

and *L’Art d’Amors* (Jacques d’Amiens), Dr. Gustav
Körting, Leipzig, 1868, ll. 2051–2061 :

La ou pues bien ton huis ouvrir
ens le pues mettre et recoillir.
encor te voel ie consellier :
fai le un petit dehors muser.

Si lor dist : "Qui la vie maine
Qu'en pensée avés à mener,
Son cuer convient amesurer
Contre son vouloir à la fois,
Car li cuers n'entent que ses drois."

"One ought," says Isabel,

"Tous temps si privéement 3621.
Ouvrer que mal-parliere gent,
N'enviens, en sacent que dire."

Word will be sent, she adds,

"Par lettres que feray parler 3651.
En mon non sans nul mot sonner
De ma dame pour riens qui soit,
Pour le peril s'il avenoit
Que li garçons eüst perdu
Les lettres."

Isabel knows her world. A jealous lady of Vermandois—

Moult est la dame en grant esrouer 3951.
Et moult s'avise par quel tour
Pora savoir sans lonc plait faire
La verité de cest affaire—

sets a spy upon the châtelain's goings and comings. Hence it is Fayel who admits the châtelain when he knocks at the secret door one night. The visitor protests that he comes to see Isabel, who bears him out and is confirmed by her mistress—a very dramatic scene (ll. 4648 ff.):

"Voir," dist li sires, "j'ay merveilles 4733.
Je croy que siec sus mes oreilles,
Ne sai que penser ne que dire
Si bel vous savés escondire.
Or chastelains, vous en irés."

From this point clever deception degenerates into vulgar subterfuge. Domestic peace at Fayel has vanished. The lord

Sa fame remprose forment 6212.
Mès n'ose pas son maltalent
Moustre par batre, tant est sage,
Car elle estoit de grant linage.

It comes about that the châtelain joins a crusading party for the East. At the last moment the lady is refused permission to go. She has shown overmuch eagerness. The châtelain cannot now withdraw. In the East he dies. His heart, he commands, shall be given to Lady Fayel as memento of their loves. Fayel intervenes. The châtelain's heart is served as a choice morsel at table. The

lady, convinced of what she has partaken, is overcome with grief and speedily dies. Fayel seeks distraction in travel, but can find none whatsoever. After a few months he dies.

Such a tragedy must, I think, seem startling after what we have been examining. It would appear that it required a good century and a half for the Celtic depth of feeling to gain any real hold upon French minds.²⁹ Speaking of *Flamenca*, M. Paul Meyer observes that it is a work of a period "à laquelle tôt ou tard viennent aboutir toutes les littératures : celle où le récit d'aventures, si inouïes, si variées qu'on les suppose, ne suffit plus à exciter l'intérêt, où l'imagination n'ayant plus pour les faits extérieurs la curiosité du premier âge se complait dans la description des sentiments intimes."³⁰ There are few such works in the Old French, and the *Châtelain de Coucy* is perhaps the best of them. *Sone de Nausay*, with all its genuine interest, lacks the form to give it currency. Chrétien was master almost to the end. If it is true that he wrote *Guillaume d'Angleterre*, we have but supported evidence of his genius. The story, to be sure, is mediocre. However, its author could please his public with a novel of wifely loyalty that was to find echo in the *Manekine* and *Octavian* more than a hundred years later.³¹ *Escanor* is in direct descent from *Yvain*. *Soredamor* (*Cligès*) is the first of the conventionally coy *jeunes filles*,³² and of the five heroines of intrigue here noticed Fenice, Athenais, and Idoine are "true lovers."

Doubtless in that century and a half liaisons were as usual at one period as at another.³³ We

²⁹ Cf. Lanson, *op. cit.*, p. 57—"Est-ce Chrétien qui ne comprenait pas la légende Celtique?"

³⁰ *Le Roman de Flamenca*. p. p. Paul Meyer, Paris, 1865. p. xv.

³¹ Cf. *A Comparative Study of the Poem Guillaume d'Angleterre*, by Philip Ogden. Johns Hopkins Diss. Baltimore, 1900. Other legends of good women, as wives, were much read, e. g., *Le Comte de Poitiers* and *La Violette*, cf. R. Ohle: *Ueber die romanischen Vorläufer von Shakespeare's Cymbeline*. Leipzig Diss., 1890.

³² *Soredamor* is inspired of Lavinia in the *Roman d'Énéas*, but Lavinia is not consistently modest. Cf. *Énéas*, p. p. Jacques Salverda de Grave, Halle, 1891. ll. 7857-9268.

³³ Cf. *La Satire des Femmes dans la Poésie Lyrique du Moyen Age*, by Theodore Lee Neff. Chicago Diss., Paris, 1900. pp. 68-88.

can discern that they were regarded throughout in the North of France with a certain moral earnestness. Romances of intrigue were infrequent. When undertaken, extraordinary circumstances were dwelt upon and the lovers were apt to marry. A plot of that character was sometimes only incidental. Or, as in the case of the *Châtelain de Coucy*, the story was of a sort to be deterrent in effect.³⁴ The tone of the châteaux may have been not seldom that of the chevalier de la Tour Landry: "Il n'est ou monde plus grant trayson que de decevoir aucunes gentils femmes, ne leur accroistre aucun villain blasme." The chevalier wrote in his old age. Jean de Meun, with his *viude chambre fait dame fole*,³⁵ speaks as a young man.

ALFRED J. MORRISON.

Hampden-Sidney College.

THE SUBSEQUENT UNION OF DYING DRAMATIC LOVERS.

In *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. I, No. 1, p. 54, Mr. G. C. Moore Smith calls attention to what he considers as the probable source of a couplet in *Romeo and Juliet*, Act IV, sc. 3, ll. 57-8, where Juliet says:

"stay, Tybalt stay;
Romeo, I come! this do I drink to thee."

Mr. Smith cites the last line of Marlowe's *Dido* as perhaps suggesting these last words of Juliet. The line is as follows:

"Now, sweet Iarbas stay! I come to thee (*kills herself*)."

It is true that the words of these two speeches do resemble each other in a rather striking manner, but it will be observed that the motifs are not quite the same. In the first place, the word "stay" in Juliet's speech is not spoken to her lover, but in Dido's speech the same word is addressed to the one beloved of the unhappy queen. Again, while the words of Dido are really her last, those of Juliet are only appar-

ently, or rather perhaps possibly, so. While Dido means that she will presently join her lover in another world, Juliet thinks only, it may be, of meeting Romeo in the tomb, where, at the end of her death-like sleep, they will unite and set out at once together for Mantua. It is not to be denied, however, that Juliet has some misgivings as to the effects of the potion, but she can hardly think, in spite of the fact that she places a dagger by her side as a precaution, that she and her husband are to be united in death at the tomb, much less in a future world.

A closer parallel to Dido's line, at least as far as the motifs are concerned, is to be found in a speech of Ferdinand, in the final scene of the catastrophe of Schiller's *Kabale und Liebe*, in which the hero, after Luise, his lover, has already died of poison, and after he himself has swallowed the fatal draught, says:

"Luise!—Luise!—Ich komme."

A somewhat similar motif is found in the last scene of the catastrophe of Victor Hugo's *Hernani*, ll. 2151-53, where the lovers, after they have drunk their poison and have come fully to realize the fact that they are soon to die together, say, in the midst of intense physical suffering:

"Vers des clartés nouvelles
Nous allons tout à l'heure ensemble ouvrir nos ailes.
Partons d'un vol égal vers un monde meilleur."

There is an idea underlying these tragic catastrophes that is common to many romantic dramas, the idea being a contribution from Mediæval Christianity; and this idea is the belief that tempest-tossed and star-crossed lovers, who go down in defeat in their unequal conflict in this world, will be victoriously united in another world. This idea is much akin to that of martyrdom, and is not to be considered therefore as wholly tragic. Such romantic heroes feel as if they come forth more as conquerors than as victims, and easily console themselves for their stormy and troubled earthly life by the fact that they die together, both cherishing the hope that they are about to be finally and forever united. *Hernani*, in Hugo's *Hernani*, ll. 2155-58, says to his dying sweetheart:

"Oh! béni soit le ciel qui m'a fait une vie
D'abîmes entourée et de spectres suivie,
Mais qui permet que, las d'un si rude chemin,
Je puisse m'endormir ma bouche sur ta main!"

³⁴ Cf. *La Chastelaine de Vergi*. *Romania*, xxi, pp. 165-193.

³⁵ *Roman de la Rose*, l. 9903.

When the revengeful old Duke Gomez witnesses their joyous and hopeful death, he exclaims :

"Qu'ils sont heureux !"

Their sufferings cease, and Doña Sol declares that they are only sleeping in their bridal bed in heaven.

Instead, then, of these great dramatists borrowing individual words or even phrases from one another, is it not more probable that they all go back to that Mediaeval, Christian, and Romantic idea of heroic lovers being united in a future world. If therefore one of the lovers dies a little before the other, will not the latter naturally say, "stay," or "I come?" or, if they are about to die together, will they not be likely to say, "we will set out together to an upper and better world?"

Some one may object, answering that even Antigone experienced a feeling of triumph in her death, realizing that she had obeyed a divine rather than a human law, and that therefore the idea of martyrdom is Ancient as well as Mediaeval, Pagan as well as Christian, Classical as well as Romantic. Still, it may be further argued, there was perhaps no thought in the mind of the ancient dramatic lovers of a happy and eternal union in another world.¹

JAMES D. BRUNER.

The University of North Carolina.

¹ ADDENDUM.

Since writing the above article, I have discovered a still closer parallel to Dido's line, which strengthens, I think, the probable correctness of my interpretation of the parallels in question. In Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*, Act iv, sc. 14, ll. 50-54, Antony thinking Cleopatra dead, says :

"I come my queen . . . Stay for me :
Where souls do couch on flowers, we'll hand in hand,
And with our sprightly port make the ghosts gaze :
Dido and her Aeneas shall want troops,
And all the haunt be ours."

Again, Cleopatra about to apply the asp to her breast, says, Act v, sc. 2, ll. 283-287 :

"Methinks I hear
Antony call . . . Husband, I come."

J. D. B.

A RABBINICAL ANALOGUE TO

PATELIN.

In the Introduction to his translation of *Patelin*, Dr. Holbrook expresses the view that the plot of that farce was doubtless not created. The following analogue is presented as a contribution to the investigation of the source of the plot. It is a parable by Jacob of Dubno, commonly known as the Dubner Maggid, on Deuteronomy xxxii, 18. Translated, it reads thus :

"Of the Rock that begat thee thou art unmindful, and hast forgotten God that formed thee." THE PARABLE : Reuben owed Simeon a certain sum of money. And Reuben came to Levi and besought him to give him counsel how to shake off his creditor, for Simeon was pressing him hard. And he gave him counsel that he pretend to be crazy. "When Simeon comes to thee begin thou to chirp and pipe and to leap about in dances." He did so, and when Simeon saw that he was crazy he desisted from him. Later, Reuben came to Levi and asked him for a loan for a few days ; which he granted. When the time for payment arrived, Levi came to Reuben to dun him. And Reuben began to chirp to him as he had done to Simeon, as told above. Levi raised his stick on him and struck him many a blow and said : "Lo, thou wicked man, this counsel I gave thee. Did I then advise thus with respect to me?" THE EXPLANATION : The virtues of forgetfulness with which God has favored man, have long been explained. For if there were not in him the characteristic of forgetfulness, man would not build a house or take a wife [*i. e.*, undertake anything permanent] ; as saith the Master of the Law, Rambam (blessed be his memory) : "If there were no fools the world would be destroyed." And man goes with this forgetfulness and forgets his creator and his former ; and there is no wickedness greater than this. And this is the meaning of "Of the Rock that begat thee thou art unmindful" : He begat in thee the trait of forgetfulness that thou mightst forget things ; and with compassion did the Holy One (praised be He) thus, to bring about thy welfare and thy continuance. And thou with this forgetfulness with which thou art endowed, goest and forgettest the God that formed thee.

Here we really have two analogues—one in the parable and one in the explanation. A second, and more fanciful, explanation affords a third parallel. It is nowhere recorded, as far as I know, but one may hear it in the synagogue in connection with this parable. It states that God taught man how to elude the devil by unconcernedly whistling and chirping, and man has utilized the instruction to elude Him.

In rating these analogues we must be careful to remember two things—that Jacob Dubno died in 1804, and that the *maggidim*, or traveling preachers, are prolific in the invention of parables to this day. It is therefore just possible that our parable is entirely a creation of Dubno's. On the other hand, we have grounds for believing that it is not. Dubno undertook to explain the difficult passages in the Pentateuch by means of parables. He therefore made it his business to collect these wherever he could find them—in the Talmud and the Midrash as well as in popular tradition. Jewish life has favored the preservation of folk tales, for it is still Medieval. The Renaissance did not penetrate the Ghetto. In fact, the student of history coping with the problems of Medieval culture, would spare himself a considerable amount of uncertain speculation if he went to live for some time in a typical Jewish community, for there he would find the Medieval ideals in actual operation.

Owing to the exclusiveness of the Russian Ghetto it is not likely that the French farce should have made its way there all the way from France—certainly not as a play, for until recently the Jews abominated the theater, and only those tolerate it now who have been affected by modern civilization. It is still less likely that the orthodox Rabbi Jacob should have become personally familiar with the farce or its imitations.

If other versions of the story could be discovered among Jewish legends, or if the source of Dubno's parable could be traced in older Hebrew literature, the plot of *Patelin* would be fairly well established as a popular and wide-spread Medieval tale. However the whole question is an uncertain one, and this contribution is presented for what it is worth, in the hope that it will lead to further investigation.

DAVID KLEIN.

College of the City of New York.

RICHARD STRAUSS' *SALOME* AND HEINE'S *ATTA TROLL*.

The recent performances of Richard Strauss' music-drama in Germany have served to call attention again to Oscar Wilde, whose *Salome* (1893) Strauss used as his text. Hermann Sudermann also gave to the world eight years ago the same modern and romantic motivation of the execution of John the Baptist, in the desire of the enamoured Salome to avenge not only her slighted charms but also the failure of her arts of seduction. It is more than probable that Sudermann in the composition of *Johannes* had before him Wilde's work of five years previous, for while it is quite in keeping with the spirit of modern literature that attempts should be made to represent Salome, one of the chief characters in the biblical episode, as something more than a mere passive tool in the revengeful plotting of Herodias, it seems by more than mere chance that Wilde and Sudermann should agree in the same manner of motivation.

The idea, however, was not original with Oscar Wilde. Professor Francke (*Glimpses of Modern Culture*) has called attention in this respect to Heine's *Atta Troll*. Here pass in romantic rout before the poet's eyes certain satanic women of legend and history. Last of all comes the one which fascinated Heine most.

Wirklich eine Fürstin war sie,
War Judäas Königin,
Des Herodes schönes Weib,
Die des Täufers Haupt begehrt hat.

Dieser Blutschuld halber ward sie
Auch vermaledet; als Nachtspek
Muss sie bis dem jüngsten Tage
Reiten mit der wilden Jagd.

In den Händen trägt sie immer
Jene Schüssel mit dem Haupte
Des Johannes, und sie küsst es;
Ja, sie küsst das Haupt mit Inbrunst.

Denn sie liebte einst Johannem—
In der Bibel steht es nicht,
Doch im Volke lebt die Sage
Von Herodias' blutger Liebe--

Anders wär' ja unerklärlich
Das Gelüste jener Dame—
Wird ein Weib das Haupt begehren
Eines Mannes, den sie nicht liebt?

War vielleicht ein bisschen böse
Auf den Liebsten, liess ihn köpfen;
Aber als sie auf der Schüssel
Das geliebte Haupt erblickte,

Weinte sie und ward verrückt,
Und sie starb in Liebeswahnsinn—
(Liebeswahnsinn! Pleonasmus!
Liebe ist ja schon ein Wahnsinn!)

Nächtlich auferstehend trägt sie,
Wie gesagt, das blutige Haupt
In der Hand, auf ihrer Jagdfahrt—
Doch mit toller Weiberlaune

Schleudert sie das Haupt zuweilen
Durch die Lüfte, kindisch lachend,
Und sie fängt es sehr behende
Wieder auf, wie einen Spielball.

According to Heine, the woman enamoured of John is not Salome but Herodias. The perverted and disgusting *Liebeswahnsinn* of this Herodias is reproduced in its exact details and ascribed to the daughter in Wilde's *Salome*, but it finds no place in *Johannes*. We have been accustomed to look upon these two women as equally guilty of the death of the prophet, and it is no more strange that the deeds of the one, should, by conscious poetic license (in Sudermann's *Johannes*, both women try to seduce John), be ascribed to the other, than that their names and subsequent history should be confused by Josephus (*Ant.* lib. 18. cap. 7), Nicephorus (*Hist. eccles.* lib. 1. cap. 20), and Metaphrastes (*Vita Sanctorum*).

This love element, introduced into the story is probably entirely of nineteenth century romantic origin. The editors and commentators of Heine, even if they have attempted it, have not yet given the form and source of the popular legend which he quotes. It does not seem to have existed in the older authorities on the legends of the martyrs and saints. I have searched for it in vain in the Apocryphal Gospels and Epistles, in Josephus, in the writings of the Ante-Nicene, Nicene, and Post-Nicene Fathers, in Tillemont's *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles* (1706), in the *Acta Sanctorum*, and in Baring-Gould's *Lives of the Saints*. The only passage of which Heine's

"Und sie fängt es sehr behende
Wieder auf, wie einen Spielball."

is a reminiscence, is where Eusebius Emesenus speaks of Salome playing with the head of John

the Baptist as with an apple. (Καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ δέδωκα τῷ κορασίῳ ἐπὶ πίνακι, καὶ ὡς μύλῳ προσέπαιξεν. *Oratio de adventu et Annuntiatione Joannis apud inferos.*)

In view of the well-known fertility and perversity of Heine's imagination, it is likely that he invented the *Sage* pure and simple and assigned a fictitious source. There is all the more ground for this belief by reason of the fact that Heine did exactly this thing in at least one other notable instance. The solution of the problem of the Flying Dutchman's release from his curse is in Wagner's drama taken bodily from Heine's *Aus den Memoiren des Herren von Schnabelewopski*, VII. Wagner acknowledged this indebtedness as quoted by Elster, *Heines Werke*, Bd. iv, S. 9. In the same place Elster gives the results of investigations which proved that the sources assigned by Heine for this solution were entirely fictitious.

JACOB N. BEAM.

Princeton, N. J.

SPANISH LITERATURE.

Orígenes de la Novela. Tomo I. *Introducción. Tratado histórico sobre la primitiva novela española*, por D. M. MENÉNDEZ Y PELAYO de la Real Academia Española. Madrid: Bailly-Baillière é Hijos, 1905. 8vo, dxxxiv pp.

I.

It is no exaggeration to say that this volume is one of the most remarkable contributions made in our time to the history of Spanish literature. Señor Menéndez y Pelayo's qualifications are incontestable; he is versed in many other literatures besides that of his own country, and has thus acquired the means of applying the comparative test; he seems to have read almost everything, and to have forgotten next to nothing; he covers immense tracts of difficult ground with enviable sagacity and surefootedness; and his diverse learning enables him to illuminate every aspect of his subject with ingenious and suggestive parallels. Probably he alone is competent to criticize his own work effectively. I must be content to give a general idea of its scope and value, and even this is no easy task.

After defining the relation of the Greek and Latin romances to the Spanish novel, the author at once enters upon his main theme by tracing the transmission of the Oriental apologue to the Spanish Arabs and Jews, its circulation in Spain, and its diffusion throughout Western Europe. This is a singularly useful piece of work, and it has the further merit of being the first adequate presentation of a literary development which has hitherto been obscured by fantastic theories. For the first time we are on solid ground. Unlike Royer-Collard, Señor Menéndez y Pelayo does not "disdain a fact"; he abounds in clear and definite details, and, though the inclusion of every additional fact increases the probabilities of error, his accuracy is rarely at fault. He indicates the subterranean course of *Kalilah and Dimnah* from the immemorial East to mediæval Spain; he follows the broadening European stream from the age of philosophic mystics like Ramón Lull and warrior-statesmen like Juan Manuel to the humaner, more ironic days of La Fontaine; and he vitalizes the dry bibliographical minutiae which form the basis of the exposition. Equally interesting are the analysis of *Barlaam and Josaphat*,¹ and the spirited description of the astonishing adventures and transformations undergone by a romance which was destined to stimulate the genius of men so far apart in temperament and time as Judah ben

¹ The Græco-Christian form of *Barlaam and Josaphat* is conjecturally assigned (p. xxviii), on the authority of Zotenberg, to the seventh century. The chronological point has no special bearing on Spanish literature; but, on general grounds, it may be worth while to direct attention to the present Dean of Westminster's striking discovery that the *Apology* of Aristides, long regarded as lost, is interpolated in the text of *Barlaam and Josaphat* immediately after Nachor, the impostor who poses as Barlaam, appears on the scene. See Joseph Armitage Robinson, *Texts and Studies: contributions to Biblical and patristic literature* (Cambridge, 1891), vol. I, pt. 1.

The *Apology* was written during the reign of Hadrian, and yet, until 1891, no scholar had ever detected any differences between the diction of this interpolated passage and that of the rest of the text, though the latter was written—*ex hypothesi*—some five centuries later. This may not seriously invalidate Zotenberg's conclusions as to the date of composition, but it should be a warning to those who undertake to decide questions of literary chronology and attribution on stylistic grounds. The practice has been, and is, much too common among students of Spanish literature.

Samuel the Levite, Ramón Lull, Boccaccio, Lope de Vega, Calderón, and Lessing. This is followed by a critical disquisition on Pedro Alfonso's *Disciplina clericalis*, the ultimate source of Sancho Panza's story about Lope Ruiz' goats in *Don Quixote* (Part I, chap. xx)—a tale which entered vernacular literature in the *Novellino* (No. 30), and has become a universal favorite in nurseries through the version given by the Grimms in their *Kinder- und Hausmärchen* (No. 86). Like every other critic, Señor Menéndez y Pelayo is at his best when dealing with the writers whom he most esteems. Examples of this are seen in his disquisition on Abu Bakr ibn al-Tufail (the Abubacer of the Schoolmen), whose philosophical romance so strangely anticipates the idea of Gracian's *Criticón*, and in the section which deals with Ramón Lull. The latter indeed amounts to an admirable monograph on an author with whose philosophical views few modern readers are likely to be in sympathy; but, however that may be, the picturesque figure of the passionate pilgrim is placed in the true historic perspective, and delineated with uncommon force. With this should be mentioned some curious points of contact between the characters of Abu Zaid of Sarūj and Guzmán de Alfarache (a pure coincidence, for we may be tolerably sure that Mateo Alemán never heard of Hariri); a concise but exhaustive survey of the *literatura aljamiada*, so amusingly overrated by the enthusiastic Estébanez Calderón; and an appreciation of Don Juan Manuel which constitutes a capital chapter in the history of comparative literature. The sketches of the Archpriest of Talavera and of Fray Anselmo de Turmeda (a gifted sinner who deserved to be saved from the oblivion into which he had fallen), are full of life and color. The ensuing chapter on the Romances of Chivalry—which appear, like the picaresque novels, to have some early exemplars in Arabic (p. xliii)—brings us into the full current of European literature, and the consideration of it may be reserved for another chapter.

Meanwhile, it will be convenient to note a few possible addenda or suggestions. T. W. Rhys Davids' *Buddhist Birth Stories*, or *Jātaka Tales* might be consulted in connection with some traits of *Kalilah and Dimnah* mentioned on p. xvi. The reprint of Stark (Athens, 1851), and Vittorio

Puntoni's edition of the *Directorium humanæ vitæ* (Pisa, 1884)—which includes the prolegomena omitted by Stark—are worth giving on p. xvii. By a slip of the pen Raimond de Béziers' version of *Kalilah and Dimnah* is said (p. xx) to be in French instead of in Latin. On p. xxxv, the year of Pedro Alfonso's birth is stated to be 1062, and unquestionably this is the date generally accepted—probably on the authority of Labouderie, who gives it in his edition of the *Disciplina clericalis* (Paris, 1824). It may be right, but it seems quite possible that Labouderie took the date from a passage in the preface to Pedro Alfonso's *Dialogi*. The question is whether this is correctly given in the printed editions of the treatise; it reads as follows in the British Museum codex of the *Dialogi contra Judeos* (Harleian MSS., 3861):—

"Hoc etiam baptismatis preter ea que premissa sunt credidi beatos apostolos. et sanctam ecclesiam catholicam. Hoc autem factum est anno a natiuitate domini M^{mo}. C^{mo}. VI^{sexto}. era M^{ma}. C^{ma}. XL^{ma}. III^{ta}. mense iulio. die natalis apostolorum petri et pauli."

As it stands this means that Pedro Alfonso was baptized in 1106, or 1144 of the Spanish Era. In the printed editions, however, "era M^{ma}. C^{ma}." is transformed into "ætatis meæ anno"; it might be possible to decide the point by collating other manuscripts of the *Dialogi*.

On p. xxxv, a place might be found for *La Estoria del rey Anemar e de Iosaphat e de Barlaam*, edited by F. Lauchert in vol. VII of *Romanische Forschungen*. Burton's version of the *Arabian Nights* (p. lix) appears to be little more than a brutal plagiarism from John Payne, whose translation is overlooked. Too much importance is, I think, given to King Sancho's *Castigos* (pp. xliii and lxxi): it is impossible to avoid an uneasy suspicion that, as in the case of Alfonso the Learned, Sancho has very little responsibility for some of the writings to which his name is attached. The origin of the mistake concerning the *Libro del Oso* (p. civ) has been explained by Mr. G. Tyler Northup in *Modern Language Notes*, vol. xx, p. 30. The omission of the edition of the *Corvaço*, alleged by Panzer to have been printed at Seville in 1495, is probably justified (p. cxii); Salvá is doubtful as to the existence of the edition which, according to Ménéndez and Gallardo, was published at Toledo in 1499 by Pedro Hagenbach.

However, this is an unimportant matter. But the highest compliment one can pay Señor Menéndez y Pelayo is to scrutinize his work with microscopic eyes: he is to be judged by no ordinary standard.

II.

In his fourth chapter, which is of wide and exceptional interest, Señor Menéndez y Pelayo indicates the antecedents of the romances of chivalry, beginning with the *Chanson de Roland* and Turpin's false chronicle. With a fine adroitness he threads his way through a labyrinth of perplexing details, and brings Spain into literary relation with the rest of Western Europe. Collateral questions are exhaustively discussed, and many an obscure point is made clear. It may be remarked in passing that, though Gaston Paris did at one time, as the author notes (p. cxxix), believe the first five chapters of Turpin's false chronicle to be the work of a Spanish monk attached to the monastery at Santiago de Compostela, he modified his opinion nineteen years later; his review of the third edition of Dozy's *Recherches in Romania* (vol. xi, pp. 419-426) records conclusions very similar to those arrived at by Señor Menéndez y Pelayo. The writer pleads ingeniously in support of his favorite thesis that the assonant prose of the Maynete legend in the *Crónica general* points to the existence of a Spanish poem independent of the French. The argument may not be convincing, and, in fact, it is admitted (p. cxxxv) that there are considerable difficulties in the way of accepting it; but the hypothesis is ably presented, and is worth bearing in mind. The components of *La Gran Conquista de Ultramar* are duly examined, and the relation between *Doon de la Roche* and the *Historia de Enrique fi de Oliva, rey de Iherusalem, Emperador de Constantinopla* is clearly defined (pp. cxxxvii-cxxxviii). No doubt Wolf's analysis of the latter book in *Ueber die neuesten Leistungen der Franzosen* is less valuable now that it was before Gayangos reprinted the Spanish text; but almost everything from Wolf's pen repays perusal, and this analysis should be mentioned in a note together with the informing study *Ueber die Oliva-Sage* in the Viennese Academy's *Denkschriften* (vol. vii, pp. 263-268). The legends of the Charlemagne cycle, which come next in order,

are no less interesting to students of English than to students of Spanish literature. The prose *Fierabras le geant*, translated into English by Caxton in 1485 and into Spanish forty years later under the title of *Historia de Carlo Magno y de los doce Pares*, was utilized by Calderón in *La Puente Mantible*, just as Lope de Vega utilized *I Reali di Francia* in *La Mocedad de Roldan*. These and other derivatives from the French, as well as the prolific Italian developments, are treated in the masterly pages leading up to the off-shoots of the *Roman de Troie*, of the Apollonius story, of *Partonopeus de Blois*, of *Floire et Blancheflor*, and of *Amis et Amiles*. P. cliii conveys to me the rare sensation of discovering that I have chanced to read the forty-five chapters of a Spanish book—the *Historia del rey Canamor y del infante Turian su fijo*—which has escaped the author (whose loss, in this matter, is to be envied rather than regretted). By a slow but most skillfully contrived transition, the writer passes to the diffusion of the Breton legends in the Peninsula, and in his fifth chapter attacks the formidable problem of *Amadis* and its origins.

Every page of this discussion deserves to be read with the closest attention, and, long as it is, one wishes it were longer. Everything connected with *Amadis de Gaula* is obscure and perplexing; after a minute examination (pp. cc-ccxxi) of the evidence brought forward to support the conflicting claims of Spain and Portugal, Señor Menéndez y Pelayo formulates eight provisional conclusions at which he has arrived. It may be convenient to state these conclusions in a condensed form, and to denote points of agreement, doubt, and dissent.

1. *Amadis* is a very free imitation of the Breton prose romances, chiefly of *Tristan* and *Lancelot*.

There will probably be no great difference of opinion on this point: I understand that the indebtedness of *Amadis* in this respect will be made clear in a study now passing through the press.

2. *Amadis* existed before 1325, the year in which Alfonso IV ascended the throne of Portugal. This monarch suggested an alteration in the Briolanja episode, and the fact that a change was made implies the existence of an earlier text which may be referred conjecturally to the time of Alfonso III, or Alfonso the Learned.

It may be objected that the identification of the Infante Alfonso is uncertain. On p. ccxi, Señor Menéndez y Pelayo writes:—

“El infante de quien se trata no puede ser otro (y en esto conviene todo el mundo) que don Alfonso IV, hijo primogénito del rey D. Dionis á quien sucedió en el trono en 1325, y que desde 1297 tuvo casa y corte separada de la de su padre.”

The phrase “en esto conviene todo el mundo,” is perhaps too sweeping. Madame Michaëlis de Vasconcellos in the *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie* (II Band, 2 Abteilung, p. 222) seems equally positive that the Alfonso in question was the son of Alfonso III, and brother of King Diniz. This would throw the date back to before 1312, and possibly earlier than 1304. It is safer to suspend judgment concerning these identifications, and the deductions drawn from them.

3. The author of the text put together during the reign of King Diniz was possibly—even probably—João de Lobeira who flourished between 1258–1286, and wrote the two fragments of a poem which reappears as Leonoreta's song in *Amadis* (Book II, chapter 11).

This is extremely plausible. Yet perhaps Professor Baist's suggestion—that the song is a late interpolation in Montalvo's text—deserves more consideration than it receives on p. ccxiv. It is only fair to observe that, though Señor Menéndez y Pelayo combats this theory, he does not absolutely reject it.

4. In default of data, we cannot say positively in what language the original *Amadis* was written. But, as Montalvo speaks of having “corrected” (not *translated*) the first three books, the probability is that there were several versions of the text in Portuguese and Spanish.

No doubt there were—in Montalvo's time. But two capital questions are left undecided. Did the Peninsular *Amadis* derive from a French original, and, if so, was it first translated or adopted by a Spaniard, or by a Portuguese? I am inclined to think that, though Herberay's statement may be inaccurate, there is more foundation for it than Señor Menéndez y Pelayo is disposed to allow (p. ccxvi). The existence of a lost French original appears intrinsically probable, and, if it did exist, it is just as likely to have been translated or adapted by a Spaniard as by a Portuguese.

5. *Amadís* was known in Castille from the time of López de Ayala and Ferrús : this text consisted of three books only.

This, I think, may be admitted without any reserve.

6. The assertion of Gomes Eannes de Azurara that *Amadís* was written by Vasco de Lobeira in the reign of King Fernando of Portugal deserves no credence.

Clearly not. Fernando died in 1383 : Vasco de Lobeira was knighted in 1385. The inference that he wrote *Amadís* in his boyhood is absurd in the face of it.

7. The report of a manuscript *Amadís* in Portuguese, existing in the Aveiro archives, is vague and unsatisfactory.

It certainly is. But, even if it were correct, it would throw little light on the main point. The same may be said of the Portuguese *Amadís* which is reported to have existed in the Vimiero archives. Assuming that both manuscripts ever existed, there is nothing to show their dates.

8. The only existing form of *Amadís* is Montalvo's Spanish text, the earliest known edition of which appeared in 1508. A passage in the preface proves that the book was written after 1492, for it alludes to the capture of Granada. To the three existing books of *Amadís*, Garci Ordóñez de Montalvo added a fourth, probably written by himself.

It is true that no edition of *Amadís* has as yet been found older than the Zaragoza edition of 1508, now in the British Museum. But the future may have bibliographical surprises in store. Ersch and Gruber, as well as Ebert, speak of an incunable edition,¹ and there is no reason to assume that they spoke without any warrant. For the rest, the passage in the preface is decisive only as regards the preface : the text itself may have been finished before 1492. The name of the arranger seems to be as uncertain as everything else connected with *Amadís*. In the 1508 edition it is given as Garci Rodriguez [de Montalbo]; in the

reprints of *Amadís* it appears as Garci Ordoñez ; and, in some editions of the *Sergas de Esplandián*, the writer is called Garci Gutierrez.

Admirable as is Señor Menéndez y Pelayo's presentation of the case, a few minor details suggest comment. Is it strictly accurate to describe Macandón (p. cciii.) as page to King Lisuarte ? Was he not rather a stranger who, when advanced in years, found his way to Lisuarte's court ? It seems doubtful if the episode in which he is concerned should be dismissed as insignificant (p. cciii.), for it constitutes the crucial test of the love of Amadís and Oriana. The inference that Montalvo used at least three *antiguos originales* for the Briolanza incident (p. ccix.) may be correct ; but it might be argued that the third text was Montalvo's own arrangement. By a simple oversight Brian de Monjaste is said to appear for the first time in the fourth book of *Amadís* (p. ccxxxii.) ; "don brian de monjaste, cauallero muy preciado, fijo del rey Ladasan de España" is mentioned in Book II., chapter lxij of the 1508 edition. But these and other similar trifles may be set right by a few penstrokes. It would be strange indeed if there were no slips in a work of such dimensions ; it is astonishing that they are so unimportant and so few. The temptation to follow the author in detail through the rest of this chapter, which includes an excellent discussion of the Palmerín question (now finally answered in Mr. Purser's convincing book) is considerable ; but it must be resisted, for I have already trespassed too much on the hospitality of these columns. The study of the sentimental novel in such examples as the *Siervo libre de amor* of Rodríguez de la Cámara, Fernandez de San Pedro's *Cárcel de Amor*, and the anonymous *Cuestión de Amor* is followed by a discussion of the historical novel as exemplified in Guevara's *Marco Aurelio*, which is incomparably the best ever written on the subject. The same may be said of the charming essay on Montemór, which finds its place in the eighth (and, for the present, the last) chapter ; the school of prose pastorals, from Sannazaro and Bernardim Ribeiro to Gálvez Montalvo, is reviewed with a fulness of knowledge and a warm appreciation which will be admired even by those who cannot approach the one nor share the other.

I have marked a few corrigenda and omissions.

¹*Allgemeine Encyclopädie . . .* herausgegeben von J. S. Ersch und J. G. Gruber (Leipzig, 1819), vol. III, p. 298 ; Maximilian Pfeiffer, *Amadístudien: Inaugural Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde der hohen philosophischen Fakultät der Friedrich-Alexanders-Universität, Erlangen* (Mainz, 1905), p. 2, note 1.

On page cxxxv, note, for "tomo xvi" read "tomo xvii, pp. 513-541, tomo xix, pp. 562-591, y tomo xxii, pp. 345-363." Joly would refer Benoit de Sainte-More's *Roman de Troie* to 1184 rather than to 1160 (p. cxlv). Guido delle Colonne appears to have compiled the *Historia Trojana* at the suggestion of Mateo della Porta who died in 1272; it may therefore be presumed that he began the work somewhat before this date (p. cxlv). The relation of the *Conde Partinuples* to the Icelandic *Partalopa Saga* and the Danish *Persenober* is shown by Eugen Kölbing in *Die verschiedenen Gestaltungen der Partonopeus-Sage* (*Germanistische Studien*, vol. II, pp. 55-114 and 312-316): a reference to it might be useful on p. cxlviii. Robert Kaltenbacher in *Der altfranzösische Roman, Paris et Vienne* (Erlangen, 1904) reprints the Catalan text of 1495 and the Spanish text of 1524; the story was translated by Caxton in 1485 (p. clii). An early version of the Swan-children legend in *Dolopathos* deserves mention on p. clvi. The Lansdowne ms. 362 in the British Museum proves that *Florence de Rome* was current in England during the thirteenth century. The serviceable list of books recommended on p. clx should be completed by the addition of Professor Rhys' *Hibbert Lectures* and *Studies in the Arthurian Legend*, Professor Anwyl's contributions to the *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*, and Mr. Alfred Nutt's remarkable essays in Professor Kuno Meyer's edition of *The Voyage of Bran, Son of Febal, to the Land of the Living*. On p. clxvi others besides readers of English will look for a reference to Mr. Nutt's indispensable *Studies on the Legend of the Holy Grail*. *Tristán de Leonís*, as stated on p. clxxxiv, has been ascribed to Philippe Camus (to whose publications Mr. Foulché-Delbosc refers in the *Revue hispanique*, vol. XI, pp. 587-595); the Spanish *Tristán de Leonís* derives apparently from the French of Luc, Seigneur du Château de Gast. As an illustration of the rapid diffusion of *Amadis* in Italy (p. ccxxxix), a sentence from a letter written by Bembo to Ramusio on February 4, 1512, is worth quoting:—"Ben si pare che il Valerio sia sepolto in quel suo Amadigi" (Vittorio Cian, *Decennio della vita del Bembo*, p. 206). The vogue of the book in France is shown by M. E. Bourciez in *Les mœurs polies et la littérature*

de cour sous Henri II. Señor Menéndez y Pelayo's work was probably already in print before Maximilian Pfeiffer's *Amadisstudien* (Mainz, 1905) was available; otherwise it would have been included on p. dxxvi, for it contains one or two bibliographical details usually overlooked. It is doubtful, to say the least, whether the first two parts of *Palmerín de Inglaterra* were translated into English before 1596 (p. cclxxv): Mr. Purser, indeed (*op. cit.* p. 391) is not altogether satisfied that they were printed before 1609. Lastly, on p. cdlxxvii, "Wilcox" should be "Wilson."

Possibly some of these suggestions may be utilized in the second edition which is certain to be forthcoming before long. Meanwhile, all students of Spanish literature will rejoice in the possession of a book which is at once a monument of learning and a masterpiece of artistic exposition.

JAMES FITZMAURICE-KELLY.

London.

Histoire de la Mise en scène dans le Théâtre religieux français du Moyen-Âge, par GUSTAVE COHEN. Paris, Honoré Champion, 1906. 8°, 304 pp.

The present work is a prize essay printed by the Belgian Academy, who are responsible for the choice of its subject. In this instance, they aimed less at favoring original research than at obtaining a consistent and systematic survey of the somewhat scattered results of the latest investigations. In this Mr. G. Cohen has fully succeeded, and reference to his essay will palpably lighten the labors of future students of the mediæval drama by providing them at once with the necessary facts and authorities. The author may thus pride himself on having made a valuable addition to the extant literature on the subject.

As its title implies, his work deals less with the texts themselves than with the rubrics settling the details of stage management and stage business, and with documents of every description throwing light on the external history of the mystery plays. It is divided into three books: I. *La mise en scène dans le drame liturgique*, describing the chanting of sequences and scenes in connection with services inside the church. II. *La mise en scène dans le*

drame semi-liturgique, mainly confined to the Norman *jeu d'Adam*, which was acted just outside the porch. III. *La mise en scène dans les mystères*, covering the whole huge mass of French vernacular mysteries down to the Renaissance. The amount of materials surveyed in the last book is such, that we should have welcomed another subdivision into early and late plays, as the mainly spectacular and courtly shows arranged on behalf of, or in honor of, princes and noblemen in the fifteenth century were, on Mr. Cohen's own evidence, gotten up in a style quite different from that of the earlier plays managed by the clergy and city guilds. In fact, the *secretz*, *feintes*, and other machinery formed so prominent a feature of these entertainments, that they nearly belong to the same kind as the masks so ably discussed by Mr. Brotanek in his well-known work.

Throughout Mr. Cohen's three books, we get a careful account of whatever details have come down to us throwing light on the scene (church or square) where the plays were enacted, on the stages, the screens, the costumes and other paraphernalia used, on the class from which the players were drawn and the rehearsals that they had to go through. In the two first books, where the subject is well-defined and limited, all these particulars fall easily into their places, while in the third they bulge somewhat chaotically, owing to the amount of heterogeneous matter to be digested. Our author's attitude is on the whole sensible and sound, though I should have liked him to assume a less patronizing tone towards the artists whom he disdainfully styles *acteurs maladroits*. Why on earth could not a gifted citizen, guided by proper training and attention, and sustained by the consciousness of a high social and religious function do in the Middle Ages what many underbred and underpaid courtesans can nowadays perform on provincial stages of the continent? I have myself seen an elderly Flemish farmer act and sing his part in a religious procession and mystery with a composed and fervent zeal that could not have been excelled.

Although acquainted with Mr. E. K. Chambers' book on the mediæval stage, Mr. Cohen makes no mention of that writer's theory on the possible influence of the heathenish folk-plays on the Christian stage. The current account of the

growth of the mystery out of the sequence has appealed to the sense of symmetry of contemporary scholars with such force that they have overlooked the possible grafting of foreign slips upon the main stock, and have shut their eyes to the many points of likeness between the Teutonic folk-plays and the mysteries of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Since the appearance of Mr. E. K. Chambers' volumes, these points, though not easy to clear up, can no more be entirely neglected. One circumstance supporting Mr. Chambers' views is pointed out by Mr. Cohen himself when he writes: "Les échafauds comprenaient, comme nous venons de le voir, des constructions en bois, et, en avant des mansions, une plate-forme réservée aux évolutions des acteurs. Cet espace libre s'appelait le champ, la terre, le parc ou parquet. C'est le 'deambulatorye' des Anglais."

"Tous ces termes, comme on le voit, rappellent un temps où il n'y avait pas encore d'échafauds et où le jeu se faisait sur la terre, dans un parc, sur une pelouse" (pp. 88-89).

If the origin of the mysteries had been merely liturgical, the names applied to the stage and its parts should have shown a trace of it. The folk-plays were and are still performed on greens or meadows, and such names as field, ground or close (*champ, terre, parc*) point decidedly to the folk-play, and away from the church. However, the evidence is far too scarce and vague to allow us unduly to press this point. Real and counterfeit animals (asses, horses, dragons) are a prominent feature of the folk-plays and reappear in the mysteries, seeming to form a connecting link between the two kinds. Mr. Cohen might have entered into a closer discussion of Mr. Chambers' views, instead of simply stating that the feast of the asses was *not* imagined for the ass's sake (p. 31), and when mentioning the *serpent monté avec art* (54) ought at least to have briefly alluded to the numberless dragons and monsters that aroused and in Belgium still arouse the wonder of children young and old at folk-plays and processions.

The *forte* of Mr. Cohen's work lies in his knowledge of manuscript sources and miniatures, which he has successfully searched for testimonies on the players' costumes and on the connection between the evolution of the pictorial arts and that

of the stage. Here he has fully availed himself of the wealth of materials treasured in the libraries of Belgium and France, and while following in the footsteps of Louis Male, has unearthed a plentiful supply of fresh evidence, and put it before us in a clear and convincing manner. This book is thus another step forward in the right direction.

Its interest and usefulness are enhanced by half-a-dozen appropriately chosen photographic plates.

P. HAMELIUS.

University of Liège.

RECENT STUDIES OF *THE PEARL*.

The Author of The Pearl, Considered in the Light of his Theological Opinions. By CARLETON F. BROWN. Reprinted from the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, XIX, 1. Baltimore, 1904. 8vo, pp. 39.

The Nature and Fabric of The Pearl. By WILLIAM HENRY SCHOFIELD. Reprinted from the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, XIX, 1. Baltimore, 1904. 8vo, pp. 62.

Pearl Rendered into Modern English Verse. By S. WEIR MITCHELL. New York, The Century Co., 1906. 8vo, pp. 57.

Pearl, a Fourteenth-Century Poem. Rendered into Modern English by G. G. COULTON. London, David Nutt, 1906. 16mo, pp. viii, 51.

This noble West-country poem, the work of an unknown pietist contemporary with Chaucer and Langland, will henceforth receive increased attention. On the linguistic and the metrical side it has already been studied with some care, though much is still to be learned. As literature we are only beginning to perceive its importance. Whatever be the view taken of its purpose, we shall all agree in pronouncing it, as a record of thought, highly interesting and significant, and as a work of art, by no means lacking in skillful workmanship, in vivid coloring, in warm life. The editions announced by Professors Emerson, Holthausen, and Osgood will render the poem easily accessible to a wide body of scholars and readers.

Dr. Brown, after discussing the problem of authorship, and without great effort disposing of the Huchown and Strode theories, takes up the author's Biblical knowledge and theological opinions. He certainly makes it much more than "moderately clear" that the poet was an ecclesiastic (p. 126). On the theological side, Dr. Brown shows clearly that the poet was aiming his argument, like Bradwardine, at the Pelagian thought then current, while he was opposed to Bradwardine in asserting "that the rewards of the heavenly Kingdom are equal." Dr. Brown's argument is convincing.

Professor Schofield has not, we fear, been equally successful in maintaining his contention, which is that *The Pearl* is neither elegy nor autobiography, but is merely a conventional debate and vision setting forth a subtle theological argument. That the framework of the poem is that of a vision, and that the debate effectively expounds and defends the equality of heavenly rewards, no one will doubt; but that this *excludes* the possibility that the poem is based on a personal experience is still, we think, an open question. Mr. Coulton has referred (p. vii, note) to those ecclesiastical conditions which would allow the poet, if he was a member of a minor order, to marry. That the poet nowhere calls Pearl his daughter (p. 158, note), or that she addresses him with "Sir," is not important. He distinctly says (l. 233),

Ho watȝ me nerre þen aunte or nece,

gaining by the circumlocution a rime for *Greece*, *pryse*, *spyce*; and if we bear in mind that she was now transformed into a girl old enough to be a bride of the Lamb, there is nothing in her address inconsistent with filial devotion or love. The rebuke of l. 290,

Wy borde ȝe men, so madde ȝe be?

is addressed to men in general. With regard to the line (243),

Regretted by myn one, on nygte,

it seems a perfectly fair and plausible inference that the mother of the child was dead (p. 160); Mr. Gollancz may indeed have gone too far in supposing her to have been unfaithful; but in any case the poet's failure to speak of her can hardly be thought of as "a grave artistic fault." The relation of father and child had been especially

close; no other supposition will account for the sentiment of such lines as 9-24, 49-56, 164, 231-4, 242-5, 280, 364-6, 1172-6, 1183-8, 1206. The personal note in these lines indicates either a reference to an actual loss, or an extraordinarily vivid imagination on the part of this writer of allegory. As for his use of the conventional vision, it is no more strange than Boccaccio's use of the conventional eclogue in writing of his five-year-old daughter, Violante, or Milton's use of the conventional pastoral figure in writing of Edward King. Both Boccaccio and Milton managed to express genuine feeling; so, to our thinking, did the author of *The Pearl*.¹

Of the 1212 lines of the poem, Dr. Mitchell translates only 552, omitting such lines "as add little of value, or such as, in the larger gap [589-1140], deal with uninteresting theological or allegorical material." While for the most part employing tetrameter (except in stanza 2, which is wholly in pentameter), he does not attempt the complex verse of the original, but contents himself with three different sets of rimes *a b a b* for each stanza. He frequently resorts, moreover, to circumlocutions which are not quite faithful, at least to the atmosphere of the original. Mr. Coulton, on the other hand, renders the whole poem into a modern form which keeps surprisingly close to the original, generally preserving even the word-echoes which bind the stanzas together. Comparing the two translations, we may say that while Dr. Mitchell's is more pleasing as modern poetry, Mr. Coulton's is somewhat more literal. Both translations, however, possess decided merit. Neither translator has apparently made use of Holthausen's emendations in *Archiv* xc, 143-148, some of which must be accepted. Some details are noted below; references are to lines:

37. "That spot that I in speche expoun," M. translates "That place I sweeten with gentle rhyme"; this is not happy.

44-48. C. comes nearer the sense. M. misinterprets *wonys* in 47.

51. Why does C. render *hert* by "brain?"

115. *Stremande* is not well rendered by "quivering" (M.).

¹ Dr. Osgood appears in general to share this opinion; cp. his abstract in *Publ. M. L. A.* xxi, p. xxiv.

196. C. is content with vowel-rime (seen: stream).

254. M. changes *graye* to "blue." This is unnecessary and misleading.

278. In C. "each word" makes the sentence grammatically wrong.

302, 308. C. translates *louez* "loveth, loving." Obviously the meaning is "believes"; Gollancz reads *levez*.

337. M. here comes nearer the original.

492. "Too high a fate." M. is here preferable as a real translation.

526, 619. C. "Gait" would be better than "gate."

531. M. should have retained "full strong."

552. C. "Seems" would be better than "think."

672. C. changes needlessly to "and right."

688. C. "No" were better omitted for Mn. E.

771. C. translates *pyng* by "king."

1045. C. Better "or" for Mn. E.

1046. C. "God Himself was" would be better; cp. 1076 and the translation.

1116. C. "Drew" better.

1166. C. translates *meruelous* by "swirling." "Wondrous waters" is better, being both alliterative and literal.

Finally, Dr. Mitchell's beautiful "Afterword" forms a pendant worthy to stand by the side of Tennyson's Prefatory Lines, and, as we like to think, sounds the dominant note of the poem:

A little grave, a nameless man's distress,
And lo! a wail of lyric tenderness,
Unheard, unseen for half a thousand years,
Asks from love's equal loss the praise of tears.

CLARK S. NORTHUP.

Cornell University.

Annales de la Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau.
Tome I. Genève, Jullien, éditeur, 1905. xvi-324 pages.

The "Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau" was founded in Geneva on the sixth day of June, 1904.

Before this date the promoters of the enterprise had sent out circulars inviting persons that might

be interested to join the society. The replies received from all quarters and from all countries seemed very encouraging; they came from scientists like Berthelot and Möbius, from critics and scholars like Brunetière and Morf, from original writers like Tolstoi and Rod. Tolstoi, for instance, wrote: "*Rousseau a été mon maître depuis l'âge de 15 ans.—Rousseau et l'évangile ont été les deux grandes et bienfaisantes influences de ma vie.*"

The ultimate and chief purpose of the Society is, according to the words of its President, M. Bernard Bouvier, professor at the University of Geneva: *préparer l'édition de Genève du citoyen de Genève.*

A few months before the formation of the "Société," the city of Geneva, acting upon the request of Rousseau scholars, had decided to devote a special room of the public library to what is now called "Les Archives Jean-Jacques Rousseau." Students will find there: 1) all the manuscripts (which are obtainable) of Rousseau; 2) the different editions of his separate and collective works; 3) pictures of Rousseau and of people he knew, of places where he lived, of scenery which he has described; 4) various documents concerning Rousseau's personality, and his relations with his contemporaries; 5) the literature on Rousseau.

As there are other places where manuscripts of Rousseau are kept, especially in Neuchâtel (Switzerland), which has the richest collection, and in Paris (Bibliothèque de la Chambre des Députés), some documents, which are unpublished, will necessarily have to be procured in facsimiles.

To avail himself of the advantages of the "Archives," the student will, of course, have to go to Geneva. But it is the intention of the Society to keep all its members regularly informed as to the progress of the Rousseau researches. With this purpose in view, they will publish every year a volume which will be called *Les Annales Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, the first of which has now appeared.

The committee has endeavored to make it such as to appeal to the general literary public, and not to Rousseau students exclusively. There are, first, a few articles which are not of a merely documentary character. The paper on "Rous-

seau et le docteur Tronchin" is a praiseworthy attempt to be impartial in discussing the relations of the two men; the author is a descendant of the famous physician of Geneva.

M. Philippe Godet, in "Madame de Charrière et J.-J. Rousseau" publishes, among other valuable information, some passages of a witty defense of Thérèse Levasseur by Madame de Charrière. A woman defending another woman is rather unusual, but we can understand it very well when we remember that Madame de Charrière hated Madame de Staël, who had shortly before attacked violently, and without real proofs, the widow of Rousseau. Madame de Charrière was only too glad, therefore, to step forward in defense of the illiterate woman who could not reply herself; and under the guise of a generous action, to tear into pieces her young rival.

Those who are interested in Rousseau's music will find information in regard to his theories in the article contributed by Istel, the author of a book on the subject: "*La partition originale du Pigmalion de J. J. Rousseau.*" According to Istel, the author of the partition is really Rousseau, who made in it an attempt to bring about a kind of compromise-opera: sharing the general prejudice that the French language is not adaptable to singing, he causes Pigmalion to recite his part, while the whole musical part of the play is performed by instruments.

Other contributions will especially appeal to a smaller circle of readers. Lanson publishes very interesting results of researches made in Paris regarding the condemnation of the *Contrat Social* and *Émile*. Contrary to the traditional belief (and to Rousseau's own opinion as expressed in the "Confessions"), it would seem that Rousseau's danger, if he had stayed in France, would not have been imaginary. He might have escaped prosecution had he consented to publish anonymously. But since he insisted upon signing his name, he forced his friends to let the law take its course; he took away from them and from the government the possibility of pretending that they did not know who the author of the book was, and of leaving him undisturbed. Rousseau's idea was that it would be hypocritical not to sign his name. But, even if he had not, the public would have found out in other ways that he had written

Émile, and it would have been simply good policy to take into consideration the peculiar conditions of the time; it was merely a question of observing a conventionality which in so many cases before had favored the spreading of new ideas. Moreover, one might perhaps ask why Rousseau accepted at all the protection of high officials as he knew that, strictly speaking, they would have to disobey the law in order to stand by him. If he did not want to compromise with the law, why did he ask others to do so? Rousseau thought of looking at things from a concrete point of view; he was no doubt sincere, but nevertheless mistaken. Lanson maintains also that when Rousseau returned from England to France he was spied upon everywhere and thus had some legitimate ground for complaint.

We take pleasure in mentioning particularly the contribution of M. Théophile Dufour, an enthusiastic and conscientious Rousseauist. He publishes: 1) a very useful list of Rousseau's writings that did not find their way into editions of the works, but were printed separately; and 2) several "pages inédites" from the Geneva manuscripts.

Among other documents printed for the first time by the "Annales" may be quoted: the complete text of the "Fêtes de Ramire," from manuscripts of the Bibliothèque Nationale (the chief interest of this play is that it brought Rousseau into contact with Voltaire for the first time); a letter relating a visit to Rousseau in 1771, rue de la Plâtrière, in Paris; marginal notes of Voltaire in his copy of *Émile*.

A résumé of the true story of the remains of Rousseau, is contributed by G. Valette, together with a letter of Berthelot, who had been commissioned in 1897 to examine the body, in the Panthéon. The old story of the profanation of Voltaire and Rousseau's remains, that was started about 1826, is thus definitely dismissed as being without any foundation.

The book closes with a bibliography and "Chroniques."

If I have given a detailed account of this first volume of the *Annales*, it was in order to show the value of the publication. It will be, of course, indispensable to every Rousseau student. And as far as we know the volumes to follow may be even

more interesting. The Rousseau movement seems to gain ground continually. M. Bernard Bouvier tells us that in Geneva alone four students are preparing dissertations on Rousseau, and that several plays, having Rousseau as central character, are awaiting representation in Paris. In many European universities special courses on Rousseau are announced.

Americans ought to do their share in making this revival profitable. Of all French writers Rousseau cannot fail to interest them specially, for does he not represent—and with what force!—the Protestant spirit which stirred up France in the eighteenth century, and in a way inspired the French Revolution? Rousseau proposed to France and to the whole continent of Europe the individualism which Anglo-Saxon nations have developed to such a great extent. It was either de Vogüé or Brunetière—I do not remember now which—who said that, hard as it was to acknowledge, the ideas which pervaded France during the whole nineteenth century were of Swiss origin through Rousseau:—Swiss is altogether too narrow; Protestant would be more adequate.

So far, we notice that only two American Universities have subscribed to the *Annales*. It is to be hoped that we shall see many more on next year's list.

A. SCHINZ.

Bryn Mawr College.

Die Kasseler Grimm-Gesellschaft 1896-1905.

Erster Geschäftsbericht, erstattet von EDWARD LOHMEYER. Kassel: 1906. 8vo., 35 pp.

Some time ago, in this journal, (*M. L. N.*, June, 1904, p. 175), Philip S. Allen complained, in general, of the prevailing German methods and, in particular, of the *Kleinere Schriften* of Jacob Grimm (which, by the way, constitute eight, not six volumes, 1867-1890), as containing the very sweeping of his minor utterances. "For the broom of the German editor like that of the crossing-sweeper is thorough, and the activity of either is apt to result in some tidy piles of waste." It would be unscientific to gather from this any

rash generalization as to sweeping critical statements, but the very subject of my little notice calls for some refutation of the above-mentioned complaint. *Est modus in rebus* one is urged to quote. Certainly there ought to be a limit, set by taste, relevancy, and intrinsic value, to the serving, by publication, of everything that came from the pens of, *e. g.*, Felix Liebrecht, Reinhold Köhler, Francis J. Child, to mention some folklorists. But Jacob Grimm, Wilhelm Grimm, and Ludwig Uhland are of a caliber, so representative and prototypal in character, as to justify the publication of even the minutest details of their life and its literary utterance. These founders and classics of the science of Germanics (here used equivalent to *Germanistik*) have a rightful claim on our attention to even the minutiae of their existence. To deny this would mean putting them on a level with men of a more ordinary type. There can, therefore, really be no questioning the scientific appropriateness, beside some considerations of a subtler character, of what the Kasseler Grimm-Gesellschaft is doing and aiming at in collecting everything it can lay hold on of literary or other kind, of books and manuscripts, of letters printed and unprinted, pertaining to, directly or indirectly, the Brothers Grimm. It is indeed very gratifying to learn that the collecting activity of the society is also directed to Ludwig Grimm, a brother of the 'Brothers,' whose delicate engravings are the delight of every one interested in the *Romantik* and its time. Perhaps the interest may be extended to a fourth member of this remarkable family, Herman Grimm, the dear man, the foremost German essayist and one of the greatest of the last century. Herman Grimm, and since his demise, Reinhold Steig have, so far, given to the society the most substantial help, and it was the former, also, who strongly recommended that the aim of the Grimm-Gesellschaft should be, not only to collect, but to edit, scientifically and completely, the total extant correspondence of the two brothers. It is to be insisted that *nothing* be omitted from this corpus of letters. It might be well to contemplate, in addition and at present, the publication of the artistic work, etchings, pencil-drawings, etc., of Ludwig Grimm, especially since both Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm were frequently drawn by their brother.

It is quite in order that the Grimm-Gesellschaft should be domiciled in the capital of Hessen, the dear home country to which all the members of the Grimm family felt loyally and forever attached. The annual contribution is only one mark. Consequently, in order to enable the execution of its scientific plans, the society ought to either increase its membership from the present one hundred persons into many thousands,¹ or to combine, with a less increase, a raising of the annual fee, so as to be more proportionate to its scientific ends. To be sure, however, it remains with the Germanists, not of the German countries only, who are ploughing largely with the calves inherited from the masters of olden times, to give material aid to this undertaking. For membership address: *Vorstand der Kasseler Grimm-Gesellschaft in Kassel, Landesbibliothek.*¹

KARL DETLEV JESSEN.

Bryn Mawr, Pa.

Étude sur les Rapports Littéraires entre Genève et l'Angleterre jusqu'à la publication de la Nouvelle Héloïse, par WILLIAMSON UP DIKE VREELAND. Genève: Librairie Henry Kündig, 1901. viii-198 pages.

In view of the recent publication of Tome I of the *Annales de la Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau* (Genève, 1905), this dissertation by Professor Vreeland of Princeton deserves careful attention. Although a few years old, it is of special interest as an American contribution to the Rousseau studies which are being pursued with renewed enthusiasm at Geneva and elsewhere.

As he states in his Preface, Dr. Vreeland's purpose is to examine the theory which M. Joseph Texte has popularized in France. This theory, supported by French and English critics, including M. Brunetière on the one hand and on the other

¹ Subscriptions to the Grimm Society (25 cents a year) and contributions to its funds may be sent to the editor of the German department of the *Modern Language Notes*. Such subscriptions or contributions will be duly acknowledged in the columns of the *Modern Language Notes*. Every professor of German and every admirer of Grimm's *Fairy Tales* will be welcome to membership.—(Editor's Note.)

Mr. John Morley and Sir Leslie Stephen, is that there are distinct traces of English influence in the "Caractère genevois" and consequently in the genius of Rousseau.

In his effort to determine what grounds there might be for such assertions in regard to the genius and the works of Rousseau, the writer recognizes three factors: (1) Rousseau was born in Geneva and passed his childhood there among the bourgeoisie,—a class, however, which does not easily undergo foreign influence; (2) He had the opportunity of seeing some Englishmen, and some French and Swiss who knew England, by whom he might have been influenced; (3) He read translations of English books and descriptions of England, those of Muralt, Prévost and Voltaire, and from these may have drawn some of his ideas.

The first part of the dissertation comprising almost three-fourths of the entire subject-matter, is devoted to a detailed discussion of these factors. The chronological study of Texte's book, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau et les Origines du Cosmopolitisme Littéraire* (Paris, 1895), pages 106-107, which is given in this connection, points out inaccuracy in his quotations from the *Nouvelle Héloïse*, glaring chronological errors in his statements with regard to the Bibliothèque Britannique and the "Debating-Clubs" at Geneva, and the general lack of sufficient data for his conclusions. These observations cannot fail to afford satisfaction to those who have sought in vain among Texte's pages for convincing proofs of his assertions which tacitly deprive Rousseau of a great deal of originality in his own works.

The detailed investigation of the relations between Geneva and England from the time of the Reformation to the middle of the eighteenth century discloses a great many interesting facts which afford abundant food for thought to those disposed to sympathize with the view of Rousseau held in France in consequence of Texte's book. Although discussion of the literary influences which prevailed in a by-gone century is of an essentially theoretical nature and the documentary evidence is liable to be too general and often elusive, the testimony given here, including a number of previously unpublished letters to Jean-Alphonse Turrettini, is very enlightening and the conclusions drawn, if not convincing from a scien-

tific point of view, are none the less strongly persuasive.

The last chapter of this part of the dissertation deals with the authors from whom Rousseau may have drawn. Although an important chapter, it is perhaps the least satisfactory in that it fails to give an exhaustive list of the authors Rousseau had read before he wrote the *Nouvelle Héloïse*. Addison and other contributors to the *Spectator*, of whom Rousseau himself speaks in the *Confessions* (e. g., Livre III "Le Spectateur me plut beaucoup et me fit du bien") are passed over without mention. Dr. Vreeland speaks only of books which were written with the intention of revealing England to France (especially those of Muralt and Voltaire). In confining himself to these he seems to disregard the fact that Rousseau may have drawn as well and more profitably from English authors. Richardson is the only one of the latter who is taken into account.

The second part of the dissertation is devoted to a discussion of the alleged debt of Rousseau to Richardson and the similarities between the *Nouvelle Héloïse* and *Clarissa Harlowe*. There would be abundant material for a large-sized book on this question alone. Therefore, Dr. Vreeland, in the few pages devoted to it, could scarcely do more than indicate the problem and the conclusions that would probably be reached after a thorough investigation.¹

If, possibly, the attitude against Texte is here a little too pronounced, the conclusions reached seem eminently impartial and true. Briefly stated they are these: Rousseau borrowed from Richardson the epistolary form of his novel which *Clarissa Harlowe* and *Pamela* had made the fashion. The striking resemblances in the plan and in several of the characters of the two books are of minor importance as they are rather of an external

¹ We are surprised to find that Dr. Vreeland mentions only Sir Leslie Stephen's essay on "Cowper and Rousseau," published in the *Cornhill Magazine*, 1875, and reproduced in *Hours in a Library*, Vol. II, which deals only indirectly with the subject under discussion, while he fails to mention the essay on "Richardson's Novels" by the same author, reproduced in Vol. I of the same work which bears upon the very point in question. It seems to us that the contentions of Mr. Stephen in the latter essay do not harmonize with Dr. Vreeland's statements on pages 153-154.

nature. Dr. Vreeland considers that the greatest service rendered by Richardson to Rousseau was the awakening of his revery, the inspiration to write a book which should have no precedent in France. But the most characteristic feature of the *Nouvelle Héloïse*, the love of nature and simplicity, is of Rousseau himself, and in having chosen the form which best suited the expression of his noble theories his merit is not diminished and his personal glory remains entire.

HELEN J. HUEBENER.

Bryn Mawr College.

CORRESPONDENCE.

DR. SOMMER'S ALLEGED DISCOVERY OF A NEW MANUSCRIPT.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—The bulk of critical material in Arthurian subjects is now so large that the need of a good bibliography grows daily more evident. This fact is brought forcibly to mind in reading Dr. Oscar Sommer's article in the December *Notes*, entitled "An Unknown Manuscript and two early printed editions of the Prose Perceval."

The MS.—B. N. f. 1428—which Dr. Sommer there identifies as the *Prose Perceval* was already identified as such in 1896, by Wechssler in his article: *Die Handschriften des Perlesvaus* (cf. *Zeitschrift für rom. Philologie*, XX, 80 ff.); and it has since been briefly compared with the remaining MSS. of the romance (cf. my study: *Perlesvaus*, Baltimore, 1902, pp. 3-19). If Dr. Sommer will consult these references and the note by Gaston Paris in *Romania*, XXII, 297, he will find further that, in addition to the MSS. he himself mentions, four other MSS. are extant; one of which, Hatton 82 of the Bodleian library, represents an extremely clear version of the text. How singular then his remark is: that "at least . . . a dozen prominent scholars . . . have during the last thirty years devoted their attention, directly or indirectly, to the romances of the Holy Grail, but none of them has challenged M. Potvin's statement"—that the Brussels MS. is unique! (Dr. Sommer says "Mons" instead of "Brussels,"

but he is evidently confusing the well-known *Perceval* MS. with that of the *Prose Perceval* or rather *Perlesvaus*, for the latter is the generally accepted name.)

With respect to the two printed versions adduced by Dr. Sommer, these too have been previously identified and discussed (cf. the bibliography given above). It is interesting to note that the Grimms (*Altdeutsche Wälder*, Cassel, 1813, vol. I) and Sir Frederick Madden (*Syr Gawayne*, p. xix) were acquainted with the romance (to be sure only as *Saint Greal*) in this printed form—in fact, Sir Frederick mentions the edition of 1516. A number of copies of both editions (1516 and 1523) were sold at good prices between 1784 and 1836 (cf. F. Michel, *Roman du St. Graal*, Bordeaux, 1841). Copies of both are not only in the British Museum, as Dr. Sommer informs us, but also in the Bibliothèque Nationale. Of the 1516 edition three copies are said to be in private hands; the copy originally belonging to Guyon de Sardièrre was brought to America some years ago by Mr. Kerr of New York and is now in the private library of Mr. Pierrepont Morgan.

I formerly believed that the printed versions were derived from B. N. f. 1428 (cf. my study, p. 18), but subsequent researches have convinced me that they were taken from a codex in which the *Perlesvaus* was part of a romance-cycle (cf. Brugger, *Zeitschrift für franz. Sprache u. Lit.* XXIX, 138). This would account for certain changes found in the printed texts; notably the ending of the first of the "last branches" (cf. *Notes*, p. 226), which is seen on comparison to be similar to that of the Hengwrt MS., the last words being: "Ceulx de la terre les appellerent saintz hommes."

That Mr. Ward should "have failed to recognize in the *conquete* the text of *Perceval le Gallois*" (Dr. Sommer of course means the *Perlesvaus* and not as the name implies the poem of Crestien) is an oversight easily explained in view of the mass of material Mr. Ward had to handle. I hope to treat these matters, together with several others, in the revised edition of my study.

WILLIAM A. NITZE.

Amherst College.

TUDOR PRONUNCIATION OF *qu* < O. E. *ū*; *ōa* < O. E. *ā*.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—The diphthonging of O. E., M. E. *ū* was in late M. E., and early Mn. E. *qu*, before it passed into the present *au*; true, we continue to write *e. g.*, 'house' but we pronounce the German 'Haus.' How current this *qu* sound was in the days of Henry VIII may be illustrated by the following apparent crux in Wyatt. In his sonnet beginning (*Tottel's Miscellany*, p. 39):

"My galley charged with forgetfulness,"
the fifth line reads:

"And euery houre, a thought in readinesse."

In Flügel's text from the ms. (*Anglia*, xviii, 464) the line reads:

and every owre a thought in redines.

Wyatt is translating Petrarca's sonnet 156 (cxxxvii):

"Passa la nave mia colma d'obblio,"

where line five reads:

A ciascun remo un pensier pronto e rio.

Evidently (*h*)*oure* 'hour' is no rendering of *remo* 'oar.' Yet we can scarcely assume that Wyatt, an excellent Italian scholar, blundered in his interpretation of the original. Nott amended to: "At every oar." No emendation, however, is needed; O. E. *ār*, M. E. *or*, *ore*, *hore*, etc., 'oar,' and M. E. *ūre* (O. Fr. *ure*), *oure* 'hour,' must have sounded so much alike in Wyatt's day that one might easily be written for the other. In both words the *h*- is parasitic.

J. M. HART.

Cornell University.

MARGUTTE AND THE MONKEY.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—A very interesting instance of Luigi Pulci's use of beast lore, excellently illustrative of his originality in adaptation, appears in the account of the death of Margutte, in the *Morgante*, xix, 145-149.

While Margutte is sleeping, Morgante pulls off and hides Margutte's boots (called *stivaletti* and *usatti*). Margutte, after waking, hunts for the boots. Stanzas 147 and 148 are as follows (in the edition of G. Volpi, Firenze, 1900, vol. II, pp. 274-275):—

"Ridea Morgante, sentendo e' si cruccia:
Margutte pure al fin gli ha ritrovati;
E vede che gli ha presi una bertuccia,
E prima se gli ha messi e poi cavati.
Non domandar se le risa gli smuccia,
Tanto che gli occhi son tutti gonfiati,
E par che gli schizzassin fuor di testa
E stava pure a veder questa festa.

A poco a poco si fu intabaccato
A questo giuoco, e le risa cresceva;
Tanto che 'l petto avea tanto serrato,
Che si volea sfibbiar, ma non poteva,
Per modo egli pare essere impacciato,
Questa bertuccia si gli rimetteva:
Allor le risa Margutte raddoppia,
E finalmente per la pena scoppia."

This episode was evidently suggested by some form of the account of the method of monkey-catching which appears in the Italian bestiaries. The substance of the account, as it appears in the bestiaries, is given by M. Goldstaub and R. Wendriner (*Ein Tosco-Venezianischer Bestiarius*, Halle, 1892, p. 281) as follows:

"Der Affe hat einen stark ausgeprägten Nachahmungstrieb, welchen die Jäger benutzen, um durch eine List ihn . . . zu fangen: vor den Augen des Affen versuchen sie, ganz enge Stiefelchen anzuziehen; nachdem sie Dies mehrere Male gethan haben, lassen sie die Stiefelchen stehen und verbergen sich in einem Hinterhalt. Der Affe kommt nun herbei, zieht die Stiefelchen an, und so am Entwischen verhindert, wird er von den Jägern ergriffen."

ERNEST H. WILKINS.

Harvard University.

THE ARCHIVES OF SOUTHERN FRANCE.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—The recent article¹ on the projected union of the notarial with the departmental

¹ *Archives notariales, leur réunion aux archives départementales . . . par F. Pasquier, Besançon, 1905.*

archives that M. Pasquier addressed to the assembly of French archivists has brought up the question whether the general condition of the latter would permit the archivists to receive this increment to their already heavy burden. Having had occasion to work in the archives of some of the principal cities of provincial France, I took advantage of the opportunity to get some idea of the value of the various deposits as well as of their arrangement and classification. As a result of this investigation, I may say that the archives of the Midi are generally richer than those of northern or central France—they have naturally suffered less from the ravages of the Revolution—and they are usually classified in a more satisfactory manner.

This, of course, does not cast any reflection on the learning of the archivists of the North, for it must be admitted that some of the most scholarly archivists are to be found in this section of the country. On the contrary, the very fact that the archivist has been productive in lines of research furnishes often the explanation for the backward condition of the archives; for, instead of going through the drudgery of classifying and arranging for the benefit of the rare *chercheur* the vast array of documents entrusted to his care, he naturally prefers to devote his time as far as possible to work in which he is personally interested. One need not be surprised then to find that there are certain archivists who are unable to give much accurate information regarding the contents of their deposits. And I might add that in one of the important cities of the Province, I found an assistant substituting for the regular archivist during his vacation, who confessed his inability to read any document of earlier date than the eighteenth century!

A very brief discussion of the condition of the deposits in some of the cities to which I refer may not be out of place here. At Bourges, I was quite disappointed to find the archives of a rather limited extent. The *Etat Civil*, which comprises the records of births and deaths, consists of but a few dozen volumes. In addition, I was informed that the *savants* who are acquainted with the scattered information contained in the departmental archives are very reluctant to communicate it to anyone who may not be an inhabitant of Berry.

At Limoges the archives are being well systematized under the direction of the learned archivist, M. Alfred Leroux. Furthermore, a handsome building has been constructed to contain this rich deposit.

Toulouse, however, makes the best impression of all. There are in this city four exceedingly rich and exceptionally well-classified deposits. These deposits are the *Etat Civil*, which is at the Donjon of the Capitole, the parliamentary and notarial archives which are both at the *Palais de Justice*, and the departmental archives at the *Préfecture*. Toulouse is the first provincial city to gather together the precious notarial documents, which in other places are to be found in great confusion in the attics or basements of the notaries' offices. Furthermore, the indefatigable archivists, M. Pasquier, M. Macary, and M. Roques, have prepared numerous tables and indices, so that rarely is any time spent in fruitless search by one who consults the deposits in their charge.

Narbonne possesses probably the richest communal archives of any city of the Province. Inventories of the greater part of these documents have already been published in several bulky volumes to which an index of names of persons and places is being prepared by the present librarian of that city. But in the near-by Montpellier, these communal deposits are of little importance. However, this is more than made up for by the rare wealth of the departmental archives which, though as yet not well arranged, possess a fund of information on the religious wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The Revolution is especially well represented at Nîmes. But it is greatly to be regretted that in this city measures regarding the union of the notarial and departmental archives have not been taken. In the office of one notary² alone, I found an immense collection of *liasses*—evidently a complete list of records extending back to the middle of the fifteenth century—stowed away in great confusion.

The archives of Arles were destroyed by fire about 1536,³ and what has accrued of importance since then has been for the most part transported to

² Maître Degors.

³ Cf. *Les Annales de la ville d'Arles, depuis . . . 1482, jusqu'à l'année 1587. Ex libris Laurentii Bonnemant presbyteri Arelatensis, 1780.* This ms. is in the library at Arles.

the departmental bureau of Marseilles. Still some very interesting documents are yet to be found in the private collections purchased by the city; and the scholarly librarian, M. Henri Dayre, is ever ready to place himself at the complete disposal of the *chercheur*. But if the necessary information is not to be found at Arles, one has only to consult the extensive deposits at Marseilles, which are being rapidly evolved from chaos into order through the untiring labor of the brilliant archivist, who cannot be adequately thanked for the services he is ever ready to lend.

The four rich deposits at Lyons differ from those at Toulouse in that the notarial system is as yet non-existent, while, of course, there is no parliamentary section. As a matter of fact, three of these deposits overlap one another and could well be brought together; and especially as it is always difficult to gain entrance to the *Hôtel-Dieu* and the *Charité*. Regarding the classification of these four deposits, it may be said that, although efforts are being made in that direction, they are yet in a somewhat chaotic state.

And finally at Dijon, the want of careful arrangement is often evident, for, notwithstanding that many volumes of Inventories have been published, it not unfrequently occurs that a *liasse* indicated therein is either misplaced or removed from the archives.

J. L. GERIG.

Columbia University.

PELER LE GEAI.

(Note to La Fontaine's Fables.)

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—M. Delboulle, in his *Les Fables de la Fontaine*, mentions a parallel between the *Miserere* of the Renclus de Moliens and *La Cigale et la Fourmi*. There is in the *Carité* another parallel, not noted in the Regnier edition of La Fontaine, which should be added to M. Delboulle's collation, pp. 63–67, under *Le geai paré des plumes du paon*. The Renclus gives evidence of familiarity with this fable in a form which justifies La Fontaine's use of *geai* as the traditional French title of the story, in preference to the *choucas* first

advanced by Baïf and Ménage and approved by Regnier (*La Fontaine, Œuvres*, I, p. 298).

The passage of the *Carité*, CLXXV–CLXXXII, discusses the redemption of the world by Mary, through the birth of Christ; the Virgin is in combat with Satan, who has taken the form of a *gai*, and crept into the forbidden nest, *i. e.* the world or the human heart, CLXXV, vv. 10–12:

Bien sot ou li gais se repust;
Tout desnichâ quanke il pust,
Et cascun jour le plume et poile.

CLXXVI, vv. 1–4:

Li gais Adan, Evain honi,
Ki dist k'il seroient oni
A le majesté souveraine
S'il manjoient dou fruit bani.

But Eve by her sin admits the *gai* into the nest, whence he is driven by the Virgin and the birth of Christ, CLXXVII, 8–12:

Quant en si bas fu ostelés
Li rois dou pais souverain;
Adonkes fu li gais pelés,
Li orguilloüs li pielés;
Le virge le mist en pelain.

The Renclus expresses his admiration for the Virgin who accomplished this great thing with one dart, a ray of humility, CLXXVIII, vv. 10–12:

Oï! se pareille ne sai.
Li gais ki en fu al essai
Ne crient plus dart dont on le fiere.

The Renclus now explains, CLXXIX, vv. 1–6:

Le gai apel nostre aversaire,
Et ses engiens se plume vaire;
Sathans est vairs com vaire plume.
Por divers engiens de mal faire
Son ni et son propre repaire
Claime ou cuer ki d'orguil fume.

But the precedent of shooting at the jay established by Mary, is followed by the ancient saints, who, CLXXX, vv. 7–9:

Le cachierent fors a un fais.
Jadis fu pelichiés li gais
Quant li peneant le despisent.

Even though the world has changed and, v. 11,

Au gai pres tout ont faite pais,

the Renclus cites the example of the Magdaleine, who, CLXXXI, vv. 1–3,

.... anicha
Chest gai ; mais puis le pelicha
Le dame et prist aspre venjanche.

The idea then of this sustained metaphor is that Satan, disguised under brilliant plumage gains admittance to the human soul. Mary strips him of these feathers, and drives him out in disgrace. In the fable the jay thus gains admittance among the peacocks, who similarly reveal the fraud and drive him out in derision. The Renclus is adapting the fable to his theme.

Let us add that *pelichier*, doubtful to Van Hamel, is certainly *peler*. If "le sens paraît être plutôt : chasser hors du nid," the fact is due to the terseness of the passages in question ; for in the author's mind *peler le gai*, i. e. 'to see his real character,' was tantamount to his expulsion. The two operations go on side by side through the passage.

A. A. LIVINGSTON.

Haverford School.

HUGGINS'S ORLANDO FURIOSO AGAIN.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS :—An attempt (in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xx, 199 f.) to determine the authorship of an eighteenth century translation of the *Orlando Furioso*, claimed for both Wm. Huggins and T. H. Croker, lacked completeness because I had been unable to find 'Part of O. F.', translated by Huggins. Recently, through the kindness of Dr. Paget Toynbee, and especially of Mr. H. A. Wilson, the Librarian of Magdalen College, Oxford, some of the missing evidence has been supplied.

That Huggins did not issue a new edition in 1757, but merely a new title-page and 'Annotations,' which would be bound up with any sets remaining in stock, is confirmed by the existence in the library of Magdalen College of a copy, in a contemporary morocco binding, of the edition of 1755, in which the original title-page has been cut out, and that of 1757 inserted, while the 'Annotations' are bound up in a separate volume with the 'Part of O. F.' and Zappi's 'Sonnets.' Moreover, the first volume contains two autograph letters, one dated 'January 1, 1755,' and signed

'The Translator,' and the other dated 'Rupert-Street, April the 2d' [1755], addressed to the President of Magdalen College, and signed 'Tem. Hen. Croker.' Croker speaks of 'these Morocco Volumes,' and proceeds : 'Pardon me in sending my Mite if such a trifle as these Sonnets are worth your own or your Library's Acceptance. The former I don't doubt of your Goodness receiving : the latter, I believe, is unsuited, but it springs from a mind, that would do all acts that could show my gratitude to my most worthy friend, W. Huggins.' That the 'translator' who signed the first letter was Huggins, is shown by some verses, in the same hand, which begin

'Mansion Rever'd accept with aspect mild
The toilsome studies of thy faithful child';

and by an inscription, in a different hand, which runs :

'D. D. Ariosto Anglius, Gulielmus Huggins Armig^r
de Headly Park in agro Hantoni. Istius Collegiⁱ olim
Socius.'

The translator of Zappi's sonnets seems thus far to be Croker, though I hope it will not seem unfair to call attention to his characteristically vague language ; he does not plainly say he translated them. It would be interesting to know why the *DNB*. ascribes this translation to Huggins.

The most important evidence, however, is the 'Part of Orlando Furioso. Translated from the Original Italian. By W. Huggins, Esq ; 1759.' After the title-page comes a Letter to the Reader, as follows :

Candid Reader,

Permit me to assure you, upon the word of a gentleman, and the faith of a christian, I have most strictly prohibited myself the inspection of the copy of those Cantos in my former book, which another, through most earnest solicitations, was, too weakly, by me admitted to be concerned in ; for fear of being thrown into any similitude of turn or identity of rhyme.

But, it can scarcely be imagined, one, who, by his immense labours in translation of a most sublime and favorite poem, proceeded to the finishing forty Cantos, could stand in need of any aid for three whole ones and four fragments ; and, that, from a person instructed by myself in the A B C of the language. So far from such effect, it has been absolutely the reverse ; for where I have, after comparison, found casually some resemblance, I have set to making alterations, where it was

feasable, for the better, but, when I have, at last, discovered it either impracticable, or too laborious to do so, and might, possibly, be for the worse, I have judged it proper to desist: not conceiving it necessary to quit a main path, which lay so natural, it could scarce be avoided, to jump over rocks or through brambles because another had stepp'd thereon before me.

The motive for suffering another to appear as the editor, with the high honours which were conferred upon him therefrom, together with an infinitude of favours done, must be as little interesting to the publick, as is the return which has been received.

The cause, which was productive of this new rendering, will need no Oedipus for its solution, on perusal of the initial and final mottoes* annexed to the studies of

Your friend
and well-wisher,

W. H.

Headley Park, Hants
June 23, 1758.

The 'three whole ones and four fragments,' which follow, are: Canto xxi, sts. 1-56; Canto xxii; Canto xxv, sts. 1-67; Canto xxvi; Canto xxvii, sts. 1-104; Canto xxxiii, sts. 1-95; and Canto xl. Canto xl ends on p. 56, where is the second of the two mottoes referred to in the Letter to the Reader. Then follow:—Extract from the Ingenious Dedication of a Poem; Inscriptions relating to Ariosto; some translations of 'Italian Quotations in my Book of Annotations'; Errata for Cantos xxii and xxv; and a translation of Canto xxxvii, sts. 1-96. Mr. Wilson comments: 'All after p. 56 seems to be a supplement to the preceding portion, perhaps first added in 1759, as the "Part of O. F." appears to have been originally issued before the end of 1758 . . . The new rendering of part of Canto xxxvii which follows what Huggins calls the "final motto" may have been added to meet some further claim on Croker's part, which had been unknown to Huggins or overlooked by him when he issued his "Part of O. F." in 1758.'

Although the question of the authorship of this translation of Ariosto is a relatively small one, it has been a real puzzle, so that it is a satisfaction to know clearly and explicitly that Croker's part was trifling, and that the honor both of its con-

ception and of its execution belongs to William Huggins, Esq., of Headly Park, Hants.

EDWARD PAYSON MORTON.

Indiana University.

ALEXANDER SCOTT'S *A Rondel of Luve*.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—It has not been noticed, I think, that Alexander Scott's *A Rondel of Luve* is practically identical with Sir Thomas Wyatt's poem beginning *Lo! what it is to love*. Except for its Scottish dialect, a change in the order of stanzas, the omission of one stanza, and a few slight differences in phraseology, Scott's *Rondel* is word for word that of Wyatt.

Wyatt's poem is found in the Egerton ms. 2711. It appears in no other manuscript, and is not in *Tottel's Miscellany* (1557). It can be found in Nott's edition of the poems of Surrey and Wyatt (London, 1815), Vol. II, p. 191; in the several imprints of the Aldine Edition; and in its original form in Flügel's transcript, *Anglia*, XIX, pp. 187-188.

Scott's *Rondel* is among the poems attributed to him in the Bannatyne ms. (1568). It has been printed in almost every collection of Scott's works. For list of occurrences see the Scottish Text Society's edition of Scott's poems (Edinburgh and London, 1896), p. 169. To this list should be added EETS. Ext. Ser. 85, and J. H. Millar's *Literary History of Scotland* (New York, 1903), p. 211.

There is a certain interest in the fact that even the limited selections of Hailes, Sibbald, Irving, Ross, Eyre-Todd, and Millar include the *Rondel*. Irving finds it "not destitute of what may be termed prettiness"; Millar considers it "as favourable a specimen of his (Scott's!) quality as any other."

All this is tribute to Wyatt. That the poem is Wyatt's no one can doubt after he has compared the two versions.

ALBERT H. LICKLIDER.

Johns Hopkins University.

* These mottoes are (1) 'Simulatum tollitur auxilium.' (p. 1.) (2) 'Imaginarium evanuit gloria.' (p. 56.)